The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXI NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1920 No. 2874

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 115

EDITORIALS:

The Menace of Another War 118

The Railway Award 119

Steel and the Inter-Church 120

SOVIET RUSSIA—1920. By Bertrand Russell 121

THE FORTY-EIGHTERS' POSITION. By Allen McCurdy 126

THE GOLDEN CAGE. By Joseph L. Freeman 127

A BOLT FROM THE BLUE. By Heywood Broun 128

NEW YORK: DICTATOR OF AMERICAN CRITICISM. By Mary Austin 129

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By The Drifter 130

CORRESPONDENCE 131

IN SUMMER. By David Morton 132

BOOKS:

Bernsdorff in America. By Norman Hapgood 132

Historical Miscellanies. By Preserved Smith 133

What the Workers Want. By George Soule 133

Woman. By Ludwig Lewisohn 134

Books in Brief 135

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 138

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER ARTHUR GLEASON

LEWIS S. GANNETT

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Adress: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swathmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

REFRESHING and hearty is the irruption by Parley P. Christensen, Farmer-Labor candidate, into the cloying "we are all safe and sane fellows together" atmosphere of the Cox-Harding campaign which even the more recent "just where do you stand on this issue" questioning has but slightly acidulated. His telegram of last week to the Republican and Democratic nominees recalls sharply that there are other issues, other worlds, other people than those which these two good-natured candidates have been amiably pattering about. There is, for instance, Eugene V. Debs, also a candidate for the Presidency, confined behind the bars of the Federal penitentiary at Atlanta. Mr. Christensen dislikes, he says, to start on a campaign while one of his opponents is in prison "for no other crime than an honest expression of his political views," and he asks that Messrs. Cox and Harding join with him in asking President Wilson to release Debs. Whether they will honor him with assent is doubtful. That Eugene Debs, twenty months after the war, ought to be out of the jail to which he should never have been sent admits of no doubt.

WE referred last week to the pointed questions which Senator Harding has addressed to Governor Cox regarding the treaty and Democratic foreign policy generally, following the interview between the Governor and the President at Washington. It will be remembered that Governor Cox, according to his own statement issued to the press, had a "delightful" meeting with Mr. Wilson "from every viewpoint." Mr. Wilson, on his part, found the interview "in every respect most satisfactory and gratifying," he and the Governor being "absolutely at one with regard to the great issue of the League of Nations." Mr. Roosevelt added the unctious wish "that every American could have been a silent witness to the meeting between these two great men." Now comes a correspondent of the New York *World*, however, who declares that the Washington conference "went into no details of the League of Nations," and that the discussion "was on broad and general lines and never did get down to specific reservations." The same correspondent cites Mr. Roosevelt as authority for the statement that neither the treaty nor the League can be regarded as "fixed issues" in the campaign, and that "the status regarding them . . . may be much changed before March 4." Governor Cox, it is said, will shortly reply to Senator Harding's questions. We do not wish to prejudge his reply, but we may at least point out that nothing short of a frank answer will satisfy the public. The exact words that were exchanged at Washington are not particularly important. What the country wants to know is precisely where the Democratic nominee stands with reference to the treaty and the League; whether he accepts Article X without reservations, or if with reservations what they are; and whether he is prepared to indorse and continue the Wilson foreign policy which Senator Harding has indicted.

SENATOR HARDING seems bent upon pursuing his inquiries still further. Following his embarrassing questions addressed to Governor Cox, he has now called attention to an extremely important statement by Colonel House made to the foreign service of the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, in London, on July 11. According to Colonel House, a suggestion was made in Paris just after the armistice to proceed at once in the making of a preliminary treaty of peace with Germany alone, based upon broad general lines and concerning four subjects—army, navy, reparations, and delineation of boundaries. The boundaries need not have been exact, but should have been so drawn as to give Germany the assurance that her loss of territory would not be greater than indicated. Such a treaty could have been made by Christmas of 1918, and would have been not only the usual but the obvious thing to do. There was at that time facing Germany the entire Allied army, militant and flushed with victory, and there would have been no delay or evasion of terms.

"All along," declares Senator Harding, "this has been the Republican conception of what ought to have been done." That may or may not be the case. The point is, if a preliminary peace with Germany could have been had by Christmas of 1918, why was the proposal rejected? Why did Mr. Wilson join with the Allies in summoning a peace conference which not only did not meet until January, but which failed to settle even preliminarily any of the questions at issue with Germany until, more than seven months after the armistice, it should have gone through the form

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of settling them all? Was Mr. Wilson so overweeningly devoted to his scheme of a League of Nations that he was willing to keep the whole world hanging for months between peace and war until he could have his way?

A NORTH CAROLINA Negro, charged with assaulting a white girl, was taken from the Person County jail and lynched. The next day it was shown indisputably by his white employer that he was innocent. Governor Bickett promptly offered the largest reward legally permissible for the apprehension of each member of the mob. A week later three Negroes, charged with assault, were jailed in the town of Graham. The Governor immediately sent a machine gun company of the State National Guard with an order which should rank well with the famous epigrams in our history which from their school days Americans like to repeat: "Captain Fowler, protect those prisoners at all hazards, and notify the people I have ordered the necessary men and machine guns to shoot straight if an attempt on the life of the prisoners is made." Unfortunately, it was deemed necessary to carry out these instructions fully. A mob formed and the machine gunners killed one and wounded two—but the Negroes were saved, law and order was vindicated, and a new name, that of Governor Thomas W. Bickett, was formally placed on the roster of those who understand their duty and are not afraid to do it. They are none too numerous, these courageous Governors of Southern States. Bickett, Democrat, has ably seconded a similarly brave stand by Governor Morrow, Republican, of Kentucky. These party distinctions have some significance in the South. Meantime, there is the other kind of State Executive. In Paris, Texas, two Negroes were burned at the stake for the alleged killing of two white men. The next day the County Sheriff declared that "at least one of the two was not the right one," and that he was doubtful whether the "other was the right party." No arrests have been made or will be, but Governor Hobby promptly replied to a telegram of protest from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that "Lamar County and Texas are amply able to take care of the situation without suggestions from the outside."

"I BELIEVE the Federal Government should stamp out lynching and remove that stain from the fair name of America"—thus Senator Harding in his speech of acceptance. He is right in pointing to Federal control as the best approach. For while a courageous Governor can do much in his State to stamp out mob murder—contrast North Carolina's one lynching to date this year with the seven in Texas—a condition so grave, so inherently destructive of everything that America must stand for, cannot be left to chance manhood in the gubernatorial seat. No passages in Senator Harding's address are more praiseworthy than those dealing with our color problem. If, as we hope, his utterances are sincere and not merely campaign rhetoric, and if the colored people and the country are not to be shamefully betrayed as they were in this, and indeed in other matters, by Woodrow Wilson, Senator Harding should define specifically what he means by saying: "The Negro citizens of America should be guaranteed the enjoyment of all their rights." The minimum requirements, in addition to a Federal anti-lynching law, are the abolition of segregation and discrimination in civil service, army, and navy, and of Jim-Crowism in interstate travel, and the enforcement by Federal commissioners of the Fifteenth Amendment.

AMERICAN adventures in imperialism are usually not on a grand scale. They manage to include most of the elements that enter into the establishment of empires farther flung, but such elements are done in miniature. Instead of girdling the Seven Seas, the American empire girdles, for the most part, a sea not even included among the seven—the Caribbean; but within those modest limits we have added to the white man's burden a whole kit-bag full of troubles. The stories of Haiti and Santo Domingo have been told in other issues of *The Nation*. This week we publish in the International Relations Section some documentary evidence as to the misuse of power by the United States in relation to another small island and another small nation. The record of the Taboga Island affair is one of high-handed, if politely-worded, diplomacy at Washington, of bullying arrogance on the spot. In November, 1918, the Governor of the Canal Zone notified the President of Panama that in a few days' time the American Government would occupy the island of Taboga for military purposes. That such discourteous haste was unnecessary is evidenced by the fact that in January, 1920, more than a year later, Secretary Lansing spoke of the "improbability of initiating the construction of defensive works on a large scale . . . in 1920," and by the fact that no steps have even yet been taken to start such construction. The earnest appeals of the representatives of Panama have received polite, evasive replies—replies which indicate only too clearly that the Department of State looks upon Panama as an inferior, fit to be notified but not consulted as to its fate. Without raising the question, which Panama itself raised only tentatively, of the original right of the United States to annex Taboga and expropriate the property of its citizens, we should certainly demand that prompt attention be paid to the moderate claims made in the various notes printed in this week's issue.

IF it be true, as a press dispatch reported the other day, that the jurists who have been busy at The Hague drafting a scheme for a High Court of International Justice have agreed that proceedings before the court may in some cases be secret, the enlightened part of the world will have little use for the plan. The reason for secrecy, it is said, is the necessity of safeguarding diplomatic interests. Whenever a case brought before the proposed court is one in which an open hearing might reveal the diplomatic secrets of either party, that party may in its discretion demand that the doors be closed and public reports of the hearings withheld. Once more, this time in a high court of the nations, the odious demands of secret diplomacy are obsequiously to be regarded. One wonders what arguments moved Mr. Elihu Root and his eminent associates, whose work at The Hague has from the beginning been lauded by the press, to give their blessing to this particular infamy. One wonders why a rule of publicity which obtains in courts of last resort in all civilized countries should be thrown to the winds when an international court is to be erected. Nothing could show more clearly the low moral plane to which those who deal with international affairs are prone to fall than this deliberate proposal to perpetuate, in the field of international jurisprudence, a practice which has repeatedly proved itself a curse. It is certainly to be hoped

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the Council of the League of Nations, before which the project of a High Court now comes, will have the courage to veto the proposal of the jurists' conference.

AGAIN we see vengeance about to be visited upon a state that made the error of taking the Allies at their word. When King Hussein, ruler of the Hejas, agreed to enter the war against Turkey, Great Britain, with the approval of France, made the Arabs a definite offer of an independent Arabia to be divided between the three sons of the king of the Hejas. Money was provided for the purpose of financing the new state; and the war was won with the help of the Arabs under the brilliant personal leadership of the young Englishman, Colonel Lawrence. At the Peace Conference the pledge to the Arabs began to lose its clear-cut outlines, although the independence of the new state was partially recognized by the admission of its delegation headed by Prince Feisal. The French thirst for Near-Eastern power and the jealous guardianship of Great Britain over the approaches to its eastern Empire combined to put the Arabs in a defensive position. "If Syria is given to France," said Prince Feisal, "the Arabs will drive them into the sea." On March 8 the Syrian Congress at Damascus proclaimed Syria an independent kingdom with Prince Feisal as its ruler. The British and French responded by announcing their refusal to recognize the new state. Syrian aspirations have received little encouragement either in the vague terms of the Turkish treaty or in the recent conferences of the Supreme Council. Such treatment of its claims, coupled with the constant menace of French occupation, has resulted in a general mobilization of Syrian troops, a military alliance with Turkey, and now, at last, a war with France. Damascus has been occupied by French troops composed of "white infantry, Algerian riflemen, African chasseurs, with Moroccans and Senegalese." "It goes without saying," reports a correspondent of the New York *Times*, "that the French will insist on the abdication of Prince Feisal, who turned on them after Paris had paid him 80,000,000 francs. He will be succeeded by a man who will consent in advance to follow French advice." What crime is greater than that of the nation that will not stay bought?

IT is always pleasant to see the dawn of enlightenment, especially where darkness has reigned. The New York *Times*, editorializing on Russian peace proposals, now says: "Lloyd George hardly conceals today his belief that England has 'backed the wrong horse' in Russia. It has, in fact, backed several of them—Denikin, Kolchak, Judenich." It may be said that this editorial hardly conceals that the *Times*, too, has persistently "backed the wrong horse," being never more fervent during months of editorializing than on the dire need of recognizing and aiding Kolchak and the various other anti-Bolshevik leaders. Its readers may well ask what horse Lloyd George should have backed, and pause for the *Times's* reply. If it is now admitted that the Denikins, Kolchaks, Judeniches, and the other effervescent "White hopes" against Red Russia were wrong horses, who then, indeed, should Lloyd George, the *Times*, and the almost unanimously anti-Soviet papers of America have supported? The Bolsheviki? Not necessarily, by any means. There has always been the alternative of decent neutrality, fair play, and willingness to let the Russians work out their own destiny without the monstrous cruelty of the blockade and a systematic campaign of deceit to justify such a course.

AMERICAN newspapers are nationalizing the Russian women again. It cannot bother the Russian women very much, for they never hear of these strange foreign-born decrees, but the meditative observer finds in them curious food for reflection on the nature of the editorial minds that give them birth. The latest fable appears on the front page of the New York *Globe*, in the Minneapolis *Tribune*, and doubtless in other papers whose editors take to the pornographic inventions of the "Cross-Atlantic News Service." Copenhagen, July 16, this tale is dated—although the New York *Sun*, elaborating on the story two days later, gives it a Paris date-line—and it reads as follows:

> "A Week of Love" has been proclaimed by Lenin, according to a report from Moscow. All unmarried women under forty-five are ordered by the decree to marry any Bolshevik desiring them. Women who have been married for four years and have not become mothers are granted immediate divorce and are subject to the same orders, to hasten their re-marriage. All women affected by the proclamation are ordered to register immediately, and later will be conducted to the Winter Palace for marriage in squads. The report says that the state has taken charge of all children over three years of age, and that family life in Russia is completely disorganized.

We are not quite sure just what a "Week of Love" may be. We should rather like to see one; Europe might profit by such an experience. Suppose that Hindenburg or Foch had proclaimed a Week of Love along the battle-front in 1918! Suppose that Lenin and Witos should proclaim such a week along the Polish frontier! Or that Clemenceau—but the thought palls. The rest of the Cross-Atlantic yarn sounds like the product of that type of mind which found such splendid opportunities for moral self-expression in the days of the white slave campaign.

IF editors must needs reflect upon the nationalization of women, and could put their anti-Bolshevist politics aside, they might find more authentic material in the files of the *Paris Médical*, a leading French medical journal. One of the editors, Paul Carnot, has been writing a series of article on the subject, "How to Save Two Million French Women from Sterility." France has no such high birth-rate as Russia, and if it is to continue to rank as a first class Power it must keep up its population. Dr. Carnot points out that France has two million more women than men today, and that if they are doomed to celibacy France will lose nearly six million potential children. The problem, he says, "demands an immediate solution, however that may modify current ideas of the family and of social responsibilities. . . . No convention, moral or social, seems to us worth depriving impoverished France of six million births." So he attempts to work out a system by which maternity—for unmarried women—may be made "a remunerative feminine career." He suggests that "maternity volunteers" be called for and be paid by the state, special prizes to be awarded for the physically fittest children. It appears that his readers, especially feminine readers, have welcomed the project with enthusiasm. This is no mere figment of an editor's imagination, like the stories of Russia; nor do we quote it in any endeavor to prove French doctors and the French nation immoral and degraded. It is simply a part of the after-war population problem which confronts many European countries today. Another French project also has interest. The new French tax upon childless men and celibates—does it not look like a step toward the nationalization of men?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Menace of Another War

EUROPE hangs wearily and almost indifferent on the brink of another war. The callous statesmen who govern today do nothing to stop the threatened catastrophe. The outlook is gloomier than at any time since the failure of the Peace Conference sent the world's hopes crashing; but it is not without hope, and the hope lies in the Bolsheviki. Those astonishing statesmen who have refused to hold non-Russian territory, who have canceled the old Russian blood bonds held against China and Turkey, and who have made peace on more than generous terms with the little Baltic states, are today the single liberal force in European diplomacy.

The Bolsheviki replied to Mr. Lloyd George's crafty suggestion of a general peace conference at London by a lengthy note which said in effect: "Mind your own business and we'll mind ours." They pointed out that they had already made peace with Esthonia, Lithuania, and Georgia, and that they are negotiating peace with Latvia and Finland; and they recalled the anything but peaceful attitude of the Allies in warning the Esthonians, when Russo-Esthonian negotiations began, that if they made peace with the Bolsheviki it would be at their own risk. But times have changed, and so has the attitude of the Allies. The Red armies have driven the Poles back some two hundred and fifty miles—a greater distance than that which separates Paris and Cologne—and the British Government has developed a sudden interest in peacemaking. When the Poles invaded the Ukraine two months ago, Soviet Russia addressed a wireless message to the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, announcing a desire for peace. The Polish legions were then advancing victoriously, and the note went unanswered. Today, the Russian armies are approaching the tentative eastern frontier of Poland drawn by the Supreme Council last autumn; Mr. Lloyd George cries out against the menace, and hastily suggests that everybody get together in London and talk things over. The Russians reply quite properly that they will be glad to treat with the Poles directly. They even say that they will give the Poles a better frontier than the Allies drew some months ago, and their acts in Esthonia and Lithuania give credence to their words. Their correct attitude makes more disgraceful the reported action of the Washington authorities in offering aid to the Poles.

It is little wonder that the Russians show small confidence in the good faith of the Allied peace proposal. The past and present actions of the British and the French give them every reason to suspect a trap. They have not forgotten that Lord Curzon induced them to cease operations against General Wrangel in South Russia pending peace negotiations, and that General Wrangel seized the occasion to open a new attack; nor are they unaware that five hundred British soldiers of various ranks were with General Wrangel's army. They are not ignorant of the three thousand Frenchmen, including nine generals, who are attached in various capacities to the Polish army; nor have they forgotten the British and French support given to Kolchak and Denikin and Judenich, nor the intervention at Archangel. Small wonder indeed that they refused to accept such Powers as disinterested mediators.

Indications are that the French Government will do everything in its power to sabotage the peace negotiations and prolong the war on Russia. Mr. Lloyd George, cannier and more cautious, works with both hands. With one hand he gestures to the Poles to open negotiations with the Russians; with the other he starts his war machinery into action in case peace fails. Military attaches are hurried from Berlin to Warsaw; military missions start from Paris; it is said that Foch may repeat his rumored visit of two months ago. Mr. Lloyd George knows well that British troops will not take kindly to another continental expedition, and reserves his promises to munitions and money; France, more generous—this France which cannot afford to pay the interest on its debt to America—is apparently ready to lavish munitions and men and money. We are not told upon what conditions this aid is promised; whether the opening of peace negotiations will put an end to the eastward current of war materials, or whether it is only the Russians who will be expected to cease military operations. If the Russians should, as it is reported they will, insist upon Polish disarmament as the first condition of peace, the Allied premiers fresh from Spa will find it hard to protest such a dose of their own medicine.

If this European crisis is safely passed, we shall have to thank the moderation of the Bolsheviki for that mercy, for there is nothing in present Allied policy to help the cause of peace. The Bolsheviki make stern but generous peace proposals and the Poles should accept them. For the Pilsudski-Grabski-Witos group it is indeed a Kaiser's choice. That aggregation of statesmen is tarred with the smirch of its imperialist pretenses. For it to abandon its territorial claims, as in any reasonable peace it must, would be to suffer a humiliation than which abdication could be no greater.

An even more serious question is the effect of the Bolshevik advance upon Germany. Colonel House believes that if Poland succumbs to Russian invasion, Germany too will turn bolshevist. He thinks that the Germans would hail the Russians as deliverers. It is doubtless true that the dictated peace terms have driven many conservative Germans in their despair and bitterness to such a pass; it is also true that large masses of radical German workingmen are heart and soul Bolsheviki. But the present German Government is of a different cast; it is dominated by men of the Stinnes type—millionaire captains of industry who believe that they can and will restore the old industrial Germany. The majority Social Democrats and the Center parties would stand with Stinnes against bolshevism; and if Soviet Russia drives its military frontier to the eastern boundaries of Germany, the reaction may be such as to force Germany to throw itself upon the Allies. Stranger things have happened. Red-hating has replaced Hun-hating in the circles that today dominate Allied policy, and if the Allies have to choose between Russians and Germans, they will doubtless choose the latter. Mr. Lloyd George, in the same speech in which he pictured the plight of Poland and the necessity of giving aid, spoke in the most cordial terms of Fehrenbach and Simons, Germany's new pilots. A German-Ally combination against Soviet Russia is not beyond history's capacity for irony. If French diplomacy succeeds in stiffening the Poles into refusal of the Soviet conditions, we may look for another Spa Conference concerned less with disarmament than with the price of military assistance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railway Award

A FAT and resounding award to the railwaymen has been made by the Railway Labor Board. The increase, as quoted by the Board on figures not yet available to the public, is $600,000,000. This lump sum makes such an imaginative appeal that the men will be generally advised to accept it. The indications as we go to press are that they will accept it. If they do, they will have commended arbitration as a sensible method of dealing with wage disputes, even if in this particular case they may be able to show that the result obtained by arbitration is not all that it should have been. In any event the country is to be congratulated that recourse to forcible methods of settlement has been avoided.

The reasons for acceptance are three, all of them concerned with public opinion. In the first place, the average man, when he hears the rich total, says: "They are getting a lot." He does not pull out pencil and paper and divide the amount by 2,000,000 men and 300 days, and compute that it means a dollar a day. Accordingly, if the award does not tally with the rise in the cost of living, it will be necessary for the experts to make this clear. This implies carefully prepared figures for the various grades of workers, and a lucid summary of the calculation for the general public, all of which requires time. A strike, called in advance of such a scientific appeal to public opinion, would outrage sentiment which is impressed by the figure of $600,000,000.

In the second place, the composition of the Labor Board won the approval of the same general public. If the Board was in fact unfairly weighted or if its method of arriving at a decision is unjust, those points have not yet been established. To reject summarily, by strike or lockout, the findings of such a board after its award had been made would subject the dissenting party to the merited disapproval of public opinion. Appeal from a decision is one thing; forcible rejection is quite another matter. Appeal means patient collection and classification of facts, careful publicity, and the lapse of time for public opinion to shift from one set of facts to another. It is high time for labor to learn to make use of research departments and the press—its own press, if necessary—to present its case in terms not of sudden ultimata but of reasoned statements of fact. The consuming public—the community that buys goods and services—remains in control of any producing group, and always will remain in control. The third reason is that the burden of expense which would be entailed by a strike at this time would fall directly upon the government, and the unpopularity of the act would be immense and hence upon the public.

For these reasons, labor is well advised in accepting the award even "under protest." At the moment, this is the attitude of a majority of the railwaymen who have been consulted. The nest egg of back pay awarded will have a powerful appeal in winning a favorable decision from the men.

A series of moves is now in order as the result of the wages award. Each railway and each group of railways in the eastern, southern, and western systems will now turn in to the Interstate Commerce Commission the costs of the recent wage increase. This bill will be added to the rate increases which the roads were already demanding. The point is that the increase will in any case be handed on to the public, since the roads have the guaranty of a fixed return on capital. We have seen a set of figures, prepared by one bureau, on the annual compensation of railway employees. We offer them, not as final, but as an example of the sort of calculation by which the matter will in the end have to be settled.

Summing up these figures, it appears that all classes (64) of railway employees, including general and division officers, were receiving for the fiscal year 1915 an average of $830. In 1920, on the January basis, they were receiving $1,587. It is estimated roughly that the new award will give an average of $1,900. The percentage of increase in 1919 over 1915 was 73 per cent. The percentage of increase in 1920 (the January basis) over 1919 was 10.5 per cent. The present award is estimated to amount to a further increase of from 20 to 27 per cent. It is clear that, as percentages go on the average, the increases, if the calculation is correct, have kept pace with the rise in the cost of living. This, however, does not answer the question as to whether or not the present wages of many grades of railwaymen meet the cost of living, or whether or not they did so five years ago. We know nothing until we know that. What does $1,900 for all classes come to for the majority of workers? What is the cost of living, estimated for various parts of the country, in the month of the award?

The figures to which we refer apply to "Class I Railways," which is supposed to include over 90 per cent of the railways of the country. The figures are previous to the award just announced. In the fiscal year 1915, general officers received salaries averaging $4,528; in 1920 (on the January basis), for the calendar year, $4,313. Maintenance of way and structural foremen received $1,107 in 1915, and $1,913 in 1920; section foremen $772 and $1,381; machinists $1,030 and $2,036; air brakemen $812 and $1,946; car repairers $751 and $1,752; section men $454 and $960; other unskilled laborers $560 and $1,119; other men in construction gangs and work trains $516 and $1,132; train dispatchers and directors $1,600 and $2,776; station agents $937 and $1,742; station masters and assistants $1,095 and $1,918; station service employees $605 and $1,157; yard engineers and motormen $1,528 and $2,349; yard firemen and helpers $916 and $1,712; yard switch tenders $720 and $1,481; other yard employees $662 and $1,201; road freight firemen and helpers $1,136 and $2,168; road freight conductors $1,589 and $2,664; road passenger engineers and motormen $2,141 and $3,129; road passenger firemen and helpers $1,287 and $2,281; road passenger conductors $1,850 and $2,730; road passenger baggagemen $1,049 and $1,962; road passenger brakemen and flagmen $1,026 and $1,816; other road train employees $840 and $1,510; crossing flagmen and gatemen $476 and $945.

Mr. Gompers, in a public statement, declares that under the award the average wages of a section worker will be $101 a month, those of a machinist less than $45 a week, those of a carpenter less than $39 a week. Are these figures correct? If so, are they a living wage? On what basis is a living wage computed? These are the facts which ought to be determined by patient inquiry in the next few weeks. The lump sum of the award is not the point. The percentage increase in wages of approximately 100 per cent is not the point. If the workers were below a proper level in 1913 or 1915, then a 100 per cent increase would not satisfy them. What amount will? The railwaymen themselves can render a service to the public at this time by studying the award from this statistical side and letting the country know the facts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Steel and the Inter-Church

AT last the report on the steel strike of 1919, prepared by the Commission of Inquiry of the Inter-Church World Movement, has been issued. The dates reveal the delay. The investigation was made between October, 1919, and February, 1920. The secretary of the Commission was Heber Blankenhorn, who had been a captain in the Military Intelligence Division of the United States army, and whose adventures in propaganda in France helped to crumble the German resistance. The investigators associated with him were George Soule, D. J. Saposs, M. Karl Wisehart, Miss Marian Savage, and Robert Littell. The report was adopted unanimously by the Commission of Inquiry on March 30, 1920. The Commission had for its chairman Bishop Francis J. McConnell, and the other members were Dr. Daniel A. Poling, associate president of the World's Christian Endeavor Union and president of the National Temperance Council; George W. Coleman, president of the Open Forum National Council; Dr. Alva W. Taylor, Dr. John McDowell, chairman of the Social Service Commission of the Presbyterian Church; Dr. Nicholas Van der Pyl, chairman of the Social Service Commission of Congregational Churches; Mrs. Fred Bennett, president of the Women's Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church and of the Council of Women for Home Missions. Two advisory members, who also signed the report, were Bishop William Melvin Bell and Bishop Charles D. Williams.

Blessed by the bishops and laymen the report was passed on, and then the lag began. The report was received by the executive committee of the Inter-Church Movement on May 10. It was recommended for publication by a sub-committee of the executive committee on June 25. It was adopted unanimously by the executive committee on June 28. On July 28 it was released for publication.

The report continues the line of important American studies of great corporations—the line begun by Henry Demarest Lloyd, Ida M. Tarbell, and Paul U. Kellogg. It makes clear the fact that the steel strike is not yet a closed question, for the causes remain, the main issues are unsettled, and the nation is ignorant of both causes and issues. The working conditions in the steel industry, which caused the strike, persist. It is now time for the nation to face the facts. The report concerns itself with these facts. Judge Gary has sailed for Europe in a refreshingly optimistic, almost gay, condition of mind. "Sunny Jim" could not have issued more tonic interviews. But there are groups of Judge Gary's workers not so gay, and it is of these that the report speaks.

The number of steel employees who are working the twelve-hour day is 69,000. The number of those who receive the lowest rate of pay—under $1,466 a year—is 70,000. This means that approximately 350,000 men, women, and children have their living conditions determined by a corporation which fixes pay and hours without conference with the labor force. "Espionage replaced collective bargaining or cooperative service."

The investigators found that the ultimate control of the plants was vested in a small group of financiers whose relation to the producing force was remote. The annual earnings of more than one-third of all productive iron and steel workers of the Steel Corporation were, and for years had been, below the level set by the government experts as the minimum standard of subsistence for families of five. 38.1 per cent of the employees of the Steel Corporation received less than $1,466 a year, and 31.5 per cent received less than $1,952. The government figures set $1,575 as a minimum subsistence level for a family of five, and $2,024 as necessary for the maintenance of an American standard of living. Nearly three-fourths of the steel workers could not earn enough for the American standard.

Further, "black lists were used, workmen were discharged for union affiliation, 'under-cover men' and 'labor detectives' were employed. In western Pennsylvania the civil rights of free speech and assembly were abrogated without just cause. Personal rights of strikers were violated by the State Constabulary and Sheriff's deputies." "The organizing campaign of the workers and the strike were for the purpose of forcing a conference in an industry where no means of conference existed." "Charges of bolshevism or of industrial radicalism in the conduct of the strike were without foundation."

The chief reason for the failure of the strike was the size of the Steel Corporation. Then, too, "the immigrant steel worker was led to expect more from the twenty-four international unions of the American Federation of Labor conducting the strike than they, through indifference, selfishness, or narrow habit, were willing to give." The causes of the strike lay in grievances which gave the workers just cause for complaint and for action. These unredressed grievances still exist in the steel industry. The report recommends a commission, set up by the Federal Government, to inaugurate conferences between the Steel Corporation and its employees for the elimination of the twelve-hour day and the seven-day week and for the readjustment of wage rates.

And for that the three hundred and thirty-six million dollar Inter-Church World Movement was ditched by Mr. Gary's friends. When one recalls the extraordinary way in which the Movement was organized and advertised, and the support which it received from clergymen and laymen high in the councils of their several denominations; when one remembers that not only wealthy men and women, but persons with slender means or the scanty accumulations of a lifetime contributed generously to the enterprise; and when one thinks of the great objective of united religious effort for the spiritual and social good of the country at which the Movement aimed, one wonders that the enterprise should have collapsed without at least a strenuous effort to maintain itself. What, after all, was the driving force behind the Movement? Was there no one among its leaders to see in advance the rock upon which the undertaking might split, and to warn of the danger in time to avoid calamity? Now the wreck has come, and let the churches take heed. From the point of view of the Steel Corporation the elimination of the twelve-hour day and of the seven-day week, and the raising of wage rates to a level permitting a decent American standard of living, or even to a level permitting a workman's wife and children to subsist, is none of the churches' business, and if they persist in interesting themselves in such matters the funds for their missionary propaganda will be cut off. The long suppression of the Inter-Church report will at least have made clear just what the churches may and may not do, and who pulls the strings.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Russia—1920

By BERTRAND RUSSELL

I. THE PROBLEM

THE attempt to form anything like a judicial estimate of the Bolsheviki is beset with difficulties. To begin with, one approaches them through a mist of myth and melodrama; their friends and their foes alike deal only in superlatives, treating them as angels or devils, not as ordinary human beings. But even when one has come to know their regime, one has still a difficult work of analysis to perform before one can arrive at what is specifically bolshevist. Much in their methods is merely Russian, and does not distinguish them from their compatriots of other parties. It is difficult to exaggerate the difference between a Russian and an Englishman. I am convinced that there is far more resemblance between Mr. Smillie and Mr. Winston Churchill than between the former and Lenin or the latter and Kolchak. If one is to judge of the Bolsheviki one must judge them in relation to the Russian people and the possible alternative governments of Russia. It is only in their international propaganda that the comparison of their ideas with those of Western Europe becomes decisive.

There is another point which is very necessary to remember in estimating what one sees. Russia was one of the nations that suffered defeat in the war; it is, therefore, more just to compare the state of affairs with what exists in Germany or Austria than with what exists in England or America. In both these respects I felt myself very inadequately equipped. I did not know Russia before the Revolution, and I have not seen Germany or Austria since the war. I hope, however, that the mere realization of the problem has helped me to avoid errors to which, as it seems to me, many English observers in Russia have been prone.

Before entering Russia, I had read a great deal of what has been written about bolshevism, both in praise and in blame; nevertheless I found both the theory and the practice of the Soviet Government very different from what I had expected. In order that the reader may know how much weight to attach to my impressions, it will be well to begin with the circumstances of my journey.

I entered Soviet Russia on May 11 and recrossed the frontier on June 16. The Russian authorities admitted me only on the express condition that I should travel with the British labor delegation, a condition with which I was naturally very willing to comply, and which that delegation kindly allowed me to fulfil. We were conveyed from the frontier to Petrograd, as well as on subsequent journeys, in a special train de luxe covered with mottoes about the social revolution and the proletariat of all countries; we were received everywhere by regiments of soldiers, with the Internationale being played on the regimental band while civilians stood bareheaded and soldiers at the salute; congratulatory orations were made by local leaders and answered by prominent communists who accompanied us; the entrances to the carriages were guarded by magnificent Bashkir cavalrymen in resplendent uniforms; in short, everything was done to make us feel like the Prince of Wales. Innumerable functions were arranged for us: banquets, public meetings, and military reviews.

The assumption was that we had come to testify to the solidarity of British labor with Russian communism, and on that assumption the utmost possible use was made of us for bolshevist propaganda. We, on the other hand, desired to ascertain what we could of Russian conditions and Russian methods of government, which was impossible in the atmosphere of a royal progress. Hence arose an amicable contest, degenerating at times into a game of hide and seek: while they assured us how splendid the banquet or parade was going to be, we tried to explain how much we should prefer a quiet walk in the streets. I, not being a member of the delegation, felt less obligation than my companions did to attend propaganda meetings where one knew the speeches by heart beforehand. In this way I was able, by the help of neutral interpreters, mostly English or American, to have many conversations with casual people whom I met in the streets or on village greens, and to find out how the whole system appears to the ordinary non-political man and woman. The first five days we spent in Petrograd, the next eleven in Moscow. During this time we were living in daily contact with important men in the Government, so that we learned the official point of view without difficulty. I saw also what I could of the intellectuals in both places. We were all allowed complete freedom to see politicians of opposition parties, and we naturally made full use of this freedom. We saw Mensheviki, Social Revolutionaries of different groups, and Anarchists; we saw them without the presence of any Bolsheviki, and they spoke freely after they had overcome their initial fears. I had an hour's talk with Lenin, virtually tete-a-tete; I met Trotzky, though only in company; I spent a night in the country with Kamenev; and I saw a great deal of other men who, though less known outside Russia, are of considerable importance in the Government.

At the end of our time in Moscow, we all felt a desire to see something of the country, and to get in touch with the peasants, since they form about 85 per cent of the population. The Government showed the greatest kindness in meeting our wishes, and it was decided that we should travel down the Volga from Nijni Novgorod to Saratov, stopping at many places, large and small, and talking freely with the inhabitants. I found this part of the time extraordinarily instructive. I learned to know more than I should have thought possible of the life and outlook of peasants, village schoolmasters, small Jewish traders, and all kinds of people. Unfortunately my friend, Clifford Allen, fell ill, and my time was much taken up with him. This had, however, one good result, namely, that I was able to go on with the boat to Astrakhan, as he was too ill to be moved off it. This not only gave me further knowledge of the country, but made me acquainted with Sverdlov, Acting Minister of Transport, who was traveling on the boat to organize the movement of oil from Baku up the Volga, and who was one of the ablest as well as kindest people whom I met in Russia.

There are a few historical facts which ought to be borne in mind. The Kerensky regime, which attempted to introduce freedom as we understand it, led to chaos and a general cessation of work; some sterner discipline was obviously necessary if the country was to be saved from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

utter destruction. Moreover, Kerensky was equally incapable of waging war and of making peace. He could not wage war because he could not preserve discipline, and he could not make peace because he was dependent upon the Allies. The Bolsheviki, who were, as Lenin himself told me, still very unpopular so late as July, 1917, acquired support quickly in the following months because they were the only people who seemed able and willing to give land to the peasants and peace to the country. At first, after the October Revolution, they were allied with the Left Social Revolutionaries, who, however, broke with them on the question of the Brest-Litovsk peace. The Left Social Revolutionaries took, and apparently still take, the position that Soviet Russia ought not, as a matter of principle, to make peace with any country that has not accomplished the social revolution; on this ground they have opposed the willingness of the Government to make peace with the Entente. English opinion goes astray through its obstinate determination to classify Russians as pro-German or pro-Entente. Because of Brest-Litovsk it falsely imagined that the Bolsheviki were pro-German. One might as well consider the Germans pro-Entente because of the Treaty of Versailles. The Russians were beaten, and only those who refused to face facts imagined it possible to continue the war. These same people, in the same spirit, protested later against attempts to make peace with the Entente.

The Bolsheviki found themselves compelled to take severe measures against the Social Revolutionaries of the Right because they joined Kolchak, and of the Left because they killed Mirbach. Since that time, opposition political parties have been illegal, with the exception of the Mensheviki. Even they were illegal for a short time, when one of their Central Committee (so at least the Bolsheviki assert) joined Denikin's cabinet. But they are now tolerated, and some of them are members of the Moscow Soviet.

After the Bolsheviki had made peace with Germany and given land to the peasants, they lost their popularity; for in Russia, as elsewhere, parties are popular on account of what they promise for the future, not on account of their performance in the past. It became clear that they could not give real peace, and that they would be compelled to remilitarize the country. They antagonized the peasants by the roughness of their methods of obtaining food for the towns, which seemed unavoidable so long as they had nothing but paper to offer in exchange for agricultural produce. Unpopularity drove them to greater repression and centralization, while the imperative need of production led them to adopt severe methods of industrial conscription. All this has produced an atmosphere which is disagreeable to a lover of freedom; but it has to be remembered that the lack of freedom is traceable to war and the blockade as its prime cause. Nothing but peace and a sufficient supply of manufactured goods can relieve the pressure from which the present evils result.

II. BOLSHEVIST THEORY

One of the first things that I discovered after passing the red flag which marks the frontier of Soviet Russia, amid a desolate region of marsh, pine wood, and barbed wire entanglements, was the profound difference between the theories of actual Bolsheviki and the version of those theories current among advanced Socialists in this country. Friends of Russia here think of the dictatorship of the proletariat as merely a new form of representative government, in which only working men and women have votes and the constituencies are partly occupational, not geographical. They think that "proletariat" means "proletariat," but "dictatorship" does not quite mean "dictatorship." This is the opposite of the truth. When a Russian Communist speaks of dictatorship, he means the word literally, but when he speaks of the proletariat, he uses the word in a Pickwickian sense. He means the "class-conscious" part of the proletariat, *i.e.*, the Communist Party. He includes people by no means proletarian (such as Lenin and Chicherin) who have the right opinions, and he excludes such wage-earners as have not the right opinions, whom he classifies as lackeys of the bourgeoisie. The Communist who sincerely believes the party creed is convinced that private property is the root of all evil; he is so certain of this that he shrinks from no measures, however harsh, which seem necessary for constructing and preserving the communist state. He spares himself as little as he spares others. He works sixteen hours a day, and foregoes his Saturday half-holiday. He volunteers for any difficult or dangerous work which needs to be done, such as clearing away piles of infected corpses left by Kolchak or Denikin. In spite of his position of power and his control of supplies, he lives an austere life. He is not pursuing personal ends, but aiming at the creation of a new social order. The same motives, however, which make him austere make him also ruthless. Marx has taught that communism is fatally predestined to come about; this fits in with the Oriental traits in the Russian character, and produces a state of mind not unlike that of the early successors of Mahomet. Opposition is crushed without mercy, and without shrinking from the methods of the Czarist police, many of whom are still employed at their old work. Since all evils are due to private property, the evils of the bolshevist regime, while it has to fight private property, will automatically cease as soon as it has succeeded.

These views are the familiar consequences of fanatical belief. To an English mind they reinforce the conviction upon which English life has been based ever since 1688, that kindliness and tolerance are worth all the creeds in the world—a view which, it is true, we do not apply to other nations or to subject races.

In a very novel society, it is natural to seek for historical parallels. The baser side of the present Russian Government is most nearly paralleled by the Directory in France, but on its better side it is closely analogous to the rule of Cromwell. The sincere Communists (and all the older members of the party have proved their sincerity by years of persecution) are not unlike the Puritan soldiers in their stern politico-moral purpose. Cromwell's dealings with Parliament are not unlike Lenin's with the Constituent Assembly. Both, starting from a combination of democracy and religious faith, were driven to sacrifice democracy to religion enforced by military dictatorship. Both tried to compel their countries to live at a higher level of morality and effort than the population found tolerable. Life in modern Russia, as in Puritan England, is in many ways contrary to instinct. And if the Bolsheviki ultimately fall, it will be for the reason for which the Puritans fell—because there comes a point at which men feel that amusement and ease are worth more than all other goods put together.

Far closer than any actual historical parallel is the parallel of Plato's Republic. The Communist Party corresponds to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the guardians; the soldiers have about the same status in both; there is in Russia an attempt to deal with family life more or less as Plato suggested. I suppose it may be assumed that every teacher of Plato throughout the world abhors bolshevism, and that every Bolshevik regards Plato as an antiquated bourgeois. Nevertheless, the parallel is extraordinarily exact between Plato's Republic and the regime which the better Bolsheviki are endeavoring to create.

Bolshevism is internally aristocratic and externally militant. The Communists have all the good and bad traits of an aristocracy which is young and vital. They are courageous, energetic, capable of command, always ready to serve the state; on the other hand they are dictatorial, lacking in ordinary consideration for the plebs, such as their servants, whom they overwork, or the people in the streets, whose lives they endanger by extraordinarily reckless motoring. They are practically the sole possessors of power, and they enjoy innumerable advantages in consequence. Most of them, though far from luxurious, have better food than other people. Only people of some political importance can obtain motor-cars or telephones. Permits for railway journeys, for making purchases at the Soviet stores (where prices are about one-fiftieth of what they are in the market), for going to the theater, and so on, are of course easier to obtain for the friends of those in power than for ordinary mortals. In a thousand ways the Communists have a life which is happier than that of the rest of the community. Above all, they are less exposed to the unwelcome attentions of the police and the extraordinary commission.

The communist theory of international affairs is exceedingly simple. The revolution foretold by Marx, which is to abolish capitalism throughout the world, happened to begin in Russia, though Marxian theory would seem to demand that it should begin in America. In countries where the revolution has not yet broken out, the sole duty of a communist is to hasten its advent. Agreements with capitalist states can only be makeshifts, and can never amount on either side to a sincere peace. No real good can come to any country without a bloody revolution: English labor men may fancy that a peaceful evolution is possible, but they will find their mistake. Lenin told me that he hopes to see a labor government in England, and would wish his supporters to work for it, but solely in order that the futility of Parliamentarism may be conclusively demonstrated to the British working man. Nothing will do any real good except the arming of the proletariat and the disarming of the bourgeoisie. Those who preach anything else are social traitors or deluded fools.

For my part, after weighing this theory carefully, and after admitting the whole of its indictment of bourgeois capitalism, I find myself definitely and strongly opposed to it. The Third Internationale is an organization which exists to promote the class war and to hasten the advent of revolution everywhere. My objection is not that capitalism is less bad than the Bolsheviki believe, but that socialism is less good, at any rate in the form which can be brought about by war. The evils of war, especially of civil war, are certain and very great; the gains to be achieved by victory are problematical. In the course of a desperate struggle the heritage of civilization is likely to be lost, while hatred, suspicion, and cruelty become normal in the relations of human beings. In order to succeed in war a concentration of power is necessary, and from concentration of power the very same evils flow as from the capitalist concentration of wealth. For these reasons chiefly I cannot support any movement which aims at world revolution. The injury to civilization done by revolution in one country may be repaired by the influence of another in which there has been no revolution; but in a universal cataclysm civilization might go under for a thousand years. But while I cannot advocate world revolution, I cannot escape from the conclusion that the Governments of the leading capitalist countries are doing everything to bring it about. Abuse of our power against Germany, Russia, and India (to say nothing of any other countries) may well bring about our downfall, and produce those very evils which the enemies of bolshevism most dread.

The true communist is thoroughly international. Lenin, for example, so far as I could judge, is not more concerned with the interests of Russia than with those of other countries; Russia is, at the moment, the protagonist of the social revolution, and as such valuable to the world, but Lenin would sacrifice Russia rather than the revolution if the alternative should ever arise. This is the orthodox attitude, and is no doubt genuine in many of the leaders. But nationalism is natural and instinctive; through pride in the revolution it grows again even in the breasts of communists. Through the Polish war, the Bolsheviki have acquired the support of national feeling and their position in the country has been immensely strengthened.

The only time I saw Trotzky was at the opera in Moscow. The British labor delegation were occupying what had been the Czar's box. After speaking with us in the ante-chamber, he stepped to the front of the box and stood with folded arms while the house cheered itself hoarse. Then he spoke a few sentences, short and sharp, with military precision, winding up by calling for "three cheers for our brave fellows at the front," to which the audience responded as a London audience would have responded in the autumn of 1914. Trotzky and the Red Army undoubtedly now have behind them a great body of nationalist sentiment. The reconquest of Asiatic Russia has even revived what is essentially an imperialist way of feeling, though this would be indignantly repudiated by many of those in whom I seemed to detect it. Experience of power is inevitably altering communist theories, and men who control a vast governmental machine can hardly have quite the same outlook on life as they had when they were hunted fugitives. If the Bolsheviki remain in power, it may be assumed that their communism will fade, and that they will increasingly resemble any other Asiatic government—for example, our own government in India.

III. COMMUNISM AND THE SOVIET CONSTITUTION

Before I went to Russia, I imagined that I was going to see an interesting experiment in a new form of representative government. Everyone who is interested in bolshevism knows the series of elections, from the village meeting to the All-Russian Soviet, by which the people's commissaries are supposed to derive their power. We were told that, by the recall, the occupational constituencies, and so on, a new and far more perfect machinery had been devised for ascertaining and registering the popular will. One of the things we hoped to study was the question whether the Soviet system is really superior to parliamentarism in this respect.

We were not able to make any such study because the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet system is moribund. No conceivable system of free election would give majorities to the Communists, in either town or country. Various methods are therefore adopted for giving the victory to government candidates. In the first place, the voting is by show of hands, so that all who vote against the government are marked men. In the second place, no candidate who is not a Communist can have any printing done, the printing works being all in the hands of the state. In the third place, he cannot address any meetings, because the halls all belong to the state. The whole of the press is, of course, official; no independent daily is permitted. In spite of all these obstacles, the Mensheviki have succeeded in winning about 40 seats out of 1,500 in the Moscow Soviet by being known in certain large factories where the electoral campaign could be conducted by word of mouth.

But although the Moscow Soviet is nominally sovereign in Moscow, it is really only a body of electors who choose the executive committee of forty, out of which, in turn, is chosen the Presidium, consisting of nine men who meet daily and have all the power. The Moscow Soviet as a whole is supposed to meet once a week, but did not meet while we were in Moscow. The Presidium, on the contrary, meets daily. Of course, it is easy for the Government to exercise pressure over the election of the executive committee, and again over the election of the Presidium. It must be remembered that effective protest is impossible, owing to the absolutely complete suppression of free speech and free press. The result is that the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet consists only of orthodox Communists.

Kamenev, the President of the Moscow Soviet, informed us that the recall is very frequently employed; he said that in Moscow there are, on an average, thirty recalls a month. I asked him what were the principal reasons for the recall, and he mentioned four: drinking, going to the front (and being, therefore, incapable of performing the duties), change of politics on the part of the electors, and failure to make a report to the electors once a fortnight, which all members of the Soviet are expected to do. From what I saw of Russians, I should judge that almost all would be guilty in this last respect. It is evident that the recall affords opportunities for Government pressure, but I had no chance of finding out whether it is used for this purpose.

In country districts the method employed is somewhat different. It is impossible to insure that the village Soviet shall consist of Communists because, as a rule, at any rate in the villages I saw, there are no Communists. But when I asked in the villages how they were represented on the Volost (the next larger area) or the Gubernia (the area next above the Volost), I was met always with the reply that they were not represented at all. I could not verify this, and it is probably an over-statement, but all concurred in the assertion that if they elected a non-Communist representative he could not obtain a pass on the railway and, therefore, could not attend the Volost or Gubernia Soviet. I saw a meeting of the Gubernia Soviet of Saratov. The representation is so arranged that the town workers have an enormous preponderance over the surrounding peasants; but even allowing for this, the proportion of peasants seemed astonishingly small for the center of a very important agricultural area.

The All-Russian Soviet, which is constitutionally the supreme body, to which the People's Commissars are responsible, meets seldom and has become increasingly formal. Its sole function at present, so far as I could discover, is to ratify, without discussion, previous decisions of the Communist Party on matters (especially concerning foreign policy) upon which the Constitution requires its decision.

All real power is in the hands of the Communist Party, who number about 600,000 in a population of about 120,000,000. I never came across a Communist by chance: the people whom I met in the streets or in the villages, when I could get into conversation with them, almost invariably said they were of no party. The only other answer I ever had was from some of the peasants, who openly stated that they were Czarists. It must be said that the peasants' reasons for disliking the Bolsheviki are very inadequate. It is said—and all I saw confirmed the assertion—that the peasants are better off than they ever were before. I saw no one—man, woman, or child—who looked underfed in the villages. The big landowners are dispossessed, and the peasants have profited. But the towns and the army still need nourishing, and the Government has nothing to give the peasants in return for food except paper, which the peasants resent having to take. It is a singular fact that Czarist rubles are worth ten times as much as Soviet rubles, and are much commoner in the country. Although they are illegal, pocketbooks full of them are openly displayed in the market places. I do not think it should be inferred that the peasants expect a Czarist restoration; they are merely actuated by custom and dislike of novelty. They have never heard of the blockade; many hardly know that there is a war with Poland: consequently they cannot understand why the Government is unable to give them the clothes and agricultural implements that they need. Having got their land, and being ignorant of affairs outside their own neighborhood, they wish their own village to be independent, and would resent the demands of any government whatever.

Within the Communist Party there are, of course, as always in a bureaucracy, different factions, though hitherto the external pressure has prevented disunion. It seemed to me that the personnel of the bureaucracy could be divided into three classes. There are first the old revolutionists, tested by years of persecution. These men have most of the highest posts. Prison and exile have made them tough and fanatical and rather out of touch with their own country. They are honest men, with a profound belief that communism will regenerate the world. They think themselves utterly free from sentiment, but in fact they are sentimental about communism and about the regime that they are creating; they cannot face the fact that what they are creating is not communism, and that communism is anathema to the peasant, who wants his own land and nothing else. They are pitiless in punishing corruption or drunkenness when they find either among officials; but they have built up a system in which the temptations to petty corruption are tremendous, and their own materialistic theory should persuade them that under such a system corruption must be rampant.

The second class in the bureaucracy, among whom are to be found most of the men occupying political posts just below the top, consists of young *arrivistes* who are enthusiastic Bolsheviki because of the material success of bolshevism. It is these men who make the regime so odious in many ways. With them must be reckoned the army of policemen, spies, and secret agents, largely inherited from the Czarist times, who make their profit out of the fact that no one can live except by breaking the law. This aspect of bolshevism is exemplified by the Extraordinary Commission,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a body practically independent of the Government, possessing its own regiments, which are better fed than the Red Army. This body has the power of imprisoning any man or woman without trial on such charges as speculation or counter-revolutionary activity. It has shot thousands without trial, and though now it has nominally lost the power of inflicting the death penalty, it is by no means certain that it has altogether lost it in fact. It has spies everywhere, and ordinary mortals live in terror of it.

The third class in the bureaucracy consists of men who are not ardent communists, who have rallied to the Government since it has proved itself stable, and who work for it either out of patriotism or because they enjoy the opportunity of developing their ideas freely without the obstacle of traditional institutions. Among this class are to be found men of the type of the successful business man, men with the same sort of ability as is found in the American self-made trust magnate, but working for success and power, not for money. There is no doubt that the Bolsheviki are successfully solving the problem of enlisting this kind of ability in the public service without permitting it to amass wealth as it does in capitalist communities. This is perhaps their greatest success so far outside the domain of war. It makes it possible to suppose that, if Russia is allowed to have peace, an amazing industrial development may take place, making Russia a rival of the United States. The Bolsheviki are industrialists in all their aims; they love everything in modern industry except the excessive rewards of the capitalists. And the harsh discipline to which they are subjecting the workers is calculated, if anything can, to give them the habits of industry and honesty which have hitherto been lacking, and which alone prevent Russia from being one of the foremost industrial countries.

IV. LENIN AND TROTZKY AND GORKY

Soon after my arrival in Moscow I had an hour's conversation with Lenin in English, which he speaks fairly well. An interpreter was present, but his services were scarcely required. Lenin's room is very bare: it contains a big desk, some maps on the walls, two book-cases, and one comfortable chair for visitors in addition to two or three hard chairs. It is obvious that he has no love of luxury or even comfort. He is very friendly and apparently simple, entirely without a trace of *hauteur*. If one met him without knowing who he was, one would not guess that he is possessed of great power or even that he is in any way eminent. I have never met a personage so destitute of self-importance. He looks at his visitors very closely, and screws up one eye, which seems to increase alarmingly the penetrating power of the other. He laughs a great deal; at first his laugh seems merely friendly and jolly, but gradually I came to feel it rather grim. He is dictatorial, calm, incapable of fear, extraordinarily devoid of self-seeking, an embodied theory. The materialistic conception of history, one feels, is his life-blood. He resembles a professor in his desire to have the theory understood and in his fury with those who misunderstand or disagree, as also in his love of expounding. I got the impression that he despises a great many people and is an intellectual aristocrat.

The first question I asked him was as to how far he recognized the peculiarity of English economic and political conditions. I was anxious to know whether advocacy of violent revolution is an indispensable condition of joining the Third Internationale, although I did not put this question directly because others were asking it officially. His answer was unsatisfactory to me. He admitted that there is little chance of revolution in England now, and that the working man is not yet disgusted with parliamentary government. But he hopes that this result may be brought about by a labor ministry. He thinks that if Mr. Henderson, for instance, were to become Prime Minister, nothing of importance would be done; organized labor would then, so he hopes and believes, turn to revolution. On this ground he wishes his supporters in this country to do everything in their power to secure a labor majority in Parliament; he does not advocate abstention from parliamentary contests, but participation with a view to making Parliament obviously contemptible. The reasons which make attempts at violent revolution seem to most of us both improbable and undesirable in this country carry no weight with him, and seem to him mere bourgeois prejudices. When I suggested that whatever is possible in England can be achieved without bloodshed, he waved aside the suggestion as fantastic. I got little impression of knowledge or psychological imagination as regards Great Britain. Indeed, the whole tendency of Marxism is against psychological imagination, since it attributes everything in politics to purely material causes.

I asked him next whether he thought it possible to establish communism firmly and fully in a country containing such a large majority of peasants. He admitted that it was difficult, and laughed over the exchange the peasant is compelled to make of food for paper; the worthlessness of Russian paper struck him as comic. But he said—what is no doubt true—that things will right themselves when there are goods to offer to the peasant. For this he looks partly to electrification in industry, which, he says, is a technical necessity in Russia but will take ten years to complete. He spoke with enthusiasm, as they all do, of the great scheme for generating electrical power by means of peat. Of course he looks to the raising of the blockade as the only radical cure; but he was not very hopeful of this being achieved thoroughly or permanently except through revolutions in other countries. Peace between bolshevist Russia and capitalist countries, he said, must always be insecure; the Entente might be led by weariness and mutual dissensions to conclude peace, but he felt convinced that the peace would be of brief duration. I found in him, as in almost all leading Communists, much less eagerness than existed on our side for peace and the raising of the blockade. He believes that nothing of real value can be achieved except through world revolution and the abolition of capitalism; I felt that he regarded the resumption of trade with capitalist countries as a mere palliative of doubtful value.

He described the division between rich and poor peasants, and the government propaganda among the latter against the former, leading to acts of violence which he seemed to find amusing. He spoke as though the dictatorship over the peasant would have to continue a long time, because of the peasant's desire for free trade. He said he knew from statistics (what I can well believe) that the peasants have had more to eat these last two years than they ever had before, "and yet they are against us," he added a little wistfully. I asked him what to reply to critics who say that in the country he has merely created peasant proprietorship, not communism; he replied that that is not quite the truth, but he did not say what the truth is.

The last question I asked him was whether resumption of trade with capitalist countries, if it took place, would not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

create centers of capitalist influence and make the preservation of communism more difficult. It had seemed to me that the more ardent Communists might well dread commercial intercourse with the outer world, as leading to an infiltration of heresy and making the rigidity of the present system almost impossible. I wished to know whether he had such a feeling. He admitted that trade would create difficulties, but said they would be less than those of the war. He said that two years ago neither he nor his colleagues thought they could survive against the hostility of the world. He attributes their survival to the jealousies and divergent interests of the different capitalist nations, also to the power of bolshevist propaganda. He said the Germans had laughed when the Bolsheviki proposed to combat guns with leaflets, but that the event had proved the leaflets quite as powerful. I do not think he recognizes that the Labor and Socialist Parties have had any part in the matter. He does not seem to know that the attitude of British labor has done a great deal to make a first-class war against Russia impossible, since it has confined the Government to what could be done in a hole-and-corner way, and denied without a too blatant mendacity.

He thoroughly enjoys the attacks of Lord Northcliffe, to whom he wishes to send a medal for bolshevist propaganda. Accusations of spoliation, he remarked, may shock the bourgeois, but have an opposite effect upon the proletarian.

I think if I had met him without knowing who he was, I should not have guessed that he was a great man; he struck me as too opinionated and narrowly orthodox. His strength comes, I imagine, from his honesty, courage, and unwavering faith—religious faith in the Marxian gospel, which takes the place of the Christian martyr's hopes of Paradise, except that it is less egotistical. He has as little love of liberty as the Christians who suffered under Diocletian and retaliated when they acquired power. Perhaps love of liberty is incompatible with whole-hearted belief in a panacea for all human ills. If so, I cannot but rejoice in the skeptical temper of the Western world. I went to Russia believing myself a communist; but contact with those who have no doubts has intensified a thousandfold my own doubts, not only of communism, but of every creed so firmly held that for its sake men are willing to inflict widespread misery.

Trotzky, whom the Communists do not by any means regard as Lenin's equal, made more impression upon me from the point of view of intelligence and personality, though not of character. I saw too little of him, however, to have more than a very superficial impression. He has bright eyes, military bearing, lightning intelligence, and magnetic personality. He is very good-looking, with admirable wavy hair; one feels he would be irresistible to women. I felt in him a vein of gay good humor so long as he was not crossed in any way. I thought, perhaps wrongly, that his vanity was even greater than his love of power—the sort of vanity that one associates with an artist or actor. The comparison with Napoleon was forced upon one. But I had no means of estimating the strength of his communist conviction, which may be very sincere and profound.

An extraordinary contrast to both these men was Gorky, with whom I had a brief interview in Petrograd. He was in bed, apparently dying and obviously heartbroken. He begged me, in anything I might say about Russia, always to emphasize what Russia has suffered. He supports the government—as I should do, if I were a Russian—not because he thinks it faultless but because the possible alternatives are worse. One felt in him a love of the Russian people which makes their present martyrdom almost unbearable, and prevents the fanatical faith by which the pure Marxians are upheld. I felt him the most lovable, and to me the most sympathetic, of all the Russians I saw. I wished for more knowledge of his outlook, but he spoke with difficulty and was constantly interrupted by terrible fits of coughing, so I could not stay. All the intellectuals whom I met—a class who have suffered terribly—expressed their gratitude to him for what he has done on their behalf. The materialistic conception of history is all very well, but some care for the higher things of civilization is a relief. The Bolsheviki are sometimes said to have done great things for art, but I could not discover that they had done more than preserve something of what existed before. When I questioned one of them on the subject, he grew impatient, and said: "We haven't time for a new art any more than for a new religion." Unavoidably, the atmosphere is one in which art cannot flourish, because art is anarchic and resistant to organization. Gorky has done all that one man could to preserve the intellectual and artistic life of Russia. But he is dying, and perhaps it is dying too.

The Forty-Eighters' Position

By ALLEN McCURDY

THE Committee of 48 failed to create a new party at Chicago. This failure was inevitable; but it was a failure which revealed more clearly than ever the necessity for a new party. "One event is more clarifying than volumes of words," says Disraeli in Tancred. Such an event was the failure of the Committee of 48 at Chicago. More than a year ago the Committee issued a call to Americans equally opposed to revolution and to reaction, and asked the assistance of all citizens who believed that a party which should appeal to every class of our people who could not express their convictions either through the reactionary Republican and Democratic Parties or through the Socialist Party should be created. An economic platform designed to destroy privilege was created. The responsible leaders of the Committee of 48 believed that the abolition of privilege would benefit the entire American people; that a party aiming at this abolition would create an issue which could not be ignored in the campaign of 1920; and that the vanishing faith of the people in the ballot-box would be restored by the opportunity thus created to destroy economic power by political action. It ought to be remembered that this call was issued at a time when any individual who made known his opposition to both the Republican and the Democratic Parties was immediately classified as a Socialist. There was no other category in which to classify him. Consequently, the press advertised the Committee of 48 as a group of men socialistically inclined. There is no doubt that some Socialists believed the Committee of 48 was some form of socialism under another name. For many Socialists who joined the Committee of 48 expressed their preference for Eugene Debs as the Committee of 48's candidate for President, and some of these Socialists were delegates to our convention in Chicago. For this same reason, many citizens who believed with the responsible leaders of the Committee of 48 in every detail did not join the Committee of 48 because they feared it was socialistic, and it was im-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possible to reach this unknown support of our real program.

The determination of the responsible leaders of the Committee of 48 today is clear. They desire a political party operating in accordance with American institutions and American traditions and expressing its will through the ballot-box for the abolition of economic privilege for the benefit of all people. The Labor Party of the United States, whose responsible leaders are not workers, but, on the contrary, a Connecticut lawyer, a New York school teacher, a newspaper editor, and trade union labor leaders, who for years have been removed from the experience of the rank and file worker, started out to create a class party which should appeal only to organized workers and, through political propaganda, reach the minds of the rank and file of the American Federation of Labor to the end that the control of the Federation of Labor should pass from its present leadership into the leadership of the insurgents, so that, through a combination of political action and direct action, guild socialism should be introduced into American life. It is plain to any intelligent person that it is impossible for these two convictions to meet, join, merge, or amalgamate. Oil and water do not mix.

It must be remembered, in this connection, that the Labor Party of the United States was founded under the direct influence of the British Labor Party program. Journalists of opinion idealized the British Labor Party program and created a campaign throughout the country that what had been evolved in English experience through over a hundred years of growth could be transplanted from English soil and superimposed upon American life. Earnest and sincere men everywhere believed that intelligent believers in American progress could unite with the American trade union movement and form a great coalition party. This belief was so widespread as to compel the responsible leadership of the Committee of 48 to make every effort possible to secure this result. But America is not England any more than, as the intelligent leaders of the British Labor Party wisely declare, "England is not Russia." This is a fact which no words, arguments, criminations or recriminations could have established. It required *the actual experience* at Chicago to disclose this fact to every intelligent observer who saw beneath all the superficial manifestations this fundamental, irreconcilable difference of opinion between a leadership insistent upon an American political party aiming at the welfare of all the people, and a leadership insistent upon a class party devoted to the interests of the workers alone. It is the conviction of the leaders of the Committee of 48 that the rank and file of the workers of the United States of America do not know what guild socialism is, do not believe in it when they do know what it is, and will not follow a political leadership which has this end in view.

It is true that industrial life is tending more and more toward collective action. We have bankers' associations, manufacturers' associations, medical associations, and trade unionism. Within the limits of their own business or industrial activity, individual members work together and submit to the policies of their respective organizations. But it is not true that workers—any more than bankers, lawyers or doctors—*vote collectively*. The worker, the manufacturer, the lawyer, the professional man, vote as individuals, no matter how many associations or unions they belong to. This is far more universally true in America than it is in England with its older industrial civilization and its more intelligent and statesmanlike leadership which the trade union movement has been so many years in development.

The value of the failure to amalgamate at Chicago is, therefore, plain. At the right of reaction stands the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Any one who believes in reaction can vote for either of these parties and secure his heart's desire. At the left stand the Socialists, split today into two contending groups—the Socialist Party and the Farmer-Labor Party—with the idea of direct industrial action never far from their philosophy, however far it may be, and often is, from their present determination. Between these two stands the average American citizen—who is the most numerous man—belonging to every class, engaged in every kind of work. He believes neither in reaction nor in any kind of socialism. Representing these average men who are burdened by the increased cost of living, bewildered, distressed, anxious to have the problem solved peaceably according to American methods, in harmony with American traditions, through the ballot-box, stood the responsible leaders of the Committee of 48 at Chicago. They would not yield to the demands of Marxian socialism. Their stand was just as determined against the reaction of the Republican and the Democratic Parties.

This is the first time in forty years we have indicated that the three groups of opinion in America are clearly defined: First, the reactionaries as represented by the Republican and Democratic Parties; second, the group represented by the Committee of 48 opposed to reaction. No longer can they be called Socialists. Any man in America can get up since the Chicago incident and declare his opposition to the reactionary policies of the Republican and Democratic Parties without being classified as a Socialist; and third, the Socialists. Believers in socialism have the same opportunity to express their belief as have the believers in reaction. They can vote either for socialism as represented by Eugene Debs and the Socialist Party, or for socialism as represented by Mr. Christensen and the Farmer-Labor Party. The new party with its ballot-box through which the average American citizen can express his convictions has not yet appeared. Unless this party is organized, the extremes of reaction in conflict with the extremes of radicalism will have the field to themselves, and in tearing each other to pieces, orderly progress in America will be destroyed. The need for the new party was never so imperative.

The Golden Cage

By JOSEPH L. FREEMAN

Earth, sea, and sky; the proud and patient stars;
The gradual rainbow with its flags unfurled;
These are but golden unrelenting bars
Upon the secret edges of the world.
We move in beauty and are touched to tears,
Wakened to wonder, and made clean with peace;
But guarded by a thousand unseen spears
Like royal captives. There is no release.
The moments mutiny, the days rebel,
The passions clamor; better to be still;
Seek open spaces for a magic spell,
Kiss lips across a tender book, until
The last rains falling on the final leaves
Dissolve all dreaming and the heart that grieves.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Bolt From the Blue

By HEYWOOD BROUN

JOHN ROACH STRATON died and went to his appointed kingdom where he immediately sought an audience with the ruler of the realm.

"Let New York be destroyed," shouted Dr. Straton as he pushed his way into the inner room. The king was engaged at the moment in watching a sparrow fall to earth and motioned the visitor to compose himself in silence, but there was an urgency in the voice and manner of the man from earth which would not be denied. "Smite them hip and thigh," said Dr. Straton and the king looked down at him and asked, "Is the necessity immediate?"

"Delay not thy wrath," said Dr. Straton, "for today on thy Sabbath sixty thousand men, women, and children of New York have gathered together to watch a baseball game."

The ruler of the realm looked and saw that 11,967 persons were watching the Yankees and the White Sox at the Polo Grounds.

"A good husky tidal wave would confound them," urged Straton, but the king shook his head.

"Remember the judgment you heaped upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah," suggested Straton.

The ruler of the realm nodded without enthusiasm. "I remember," he said, "but as I recollect it didn't do much good."

Dr. Straton's bright hopefulness faded and the king hastened to reassure him. "We can think up something better than that," he said, and had the visitor been an observant man he might have noticed that the streets of the kingdom were paved with tact. "Now there was the Tower of Babel," said the ruler of the realm reflectively, "that was a creative idea. That was a doom which persisted because it had ingenuity as well as power. That's what we need now."

Suddenly there dawned in the face of the king an idea, and it seemed to Dr. Straton as if he were standing face to face with a sunrise. The doctor lowered his eyes and he saw that the men and the women sabbath breakers of New York were all upon their feet and shouting, though to his newly immortal senses the din came feebly. "Now," he said, with an exultation which caused him to slip into his old pulpit manner, "let 'em have it."

But the king with keener vision than Dr. Straton, saw that it was the ninth inning, the score tied, runners on first and second, and Babe Ruth coming to bat. "The time has not come," said the king, and he pushed the doctor gently and made him give ground a little. And they waited until two strikes had been pitched and three balls. The next one would have cut the heart of the plate, but Babe Ruth swung and the ball rose straight in the air. Up and up it came until it disappeared from the view of all the players and spectators and even of the umpires. Soon a mighty wrangle began. Miller Huggins claimed a home run and Kid Gleason argued that the ball was foul. The umpires waited for an hour and then, as the ball had not yet come down, Dineen was forced to make a decision and shouted "Foul!" while the crowd booed. One of the pop bottles injured him rather badly and there was a riot for which it was necessary to call out the reserves. Everybody went home disgruntled and a month later the Lusk bill abolishing Sunday baseball was passed.

And all the time the ball continued to rise until suddenly the king, thrusting out his left hand, caught it neatly and slipped it into his pocket. It was not a conventional pocket, for there were planets in it and everlasting mercy and other things. For a long time Dr. Straton had been awed into silence by the mighty miracle, but now he spoke, reverently but firmly.

"I beg your pardon," he said, "but you will observe that there is a sign in the baseball park which says 'All balls batted out of the diamond remain the property of the New York Baseball Club and should be thrown back!'"

The ruler of the realm smiled. "You forget," he answered, "that if I threw the ball back from this great height it might strike a man and kill him, it might crash through a huge office building, it might even destroy the Calvary Baptist Church."

Then for the first time a touch of sharpness came into the voice of Dr. Straton. "All that is immaterial," he said. "I think I know my theology well enough to understand that law is law and right is right, come what may."

"Oh, but it's not nearly as simple as all that," remonstrated the king. "There are right things which are so harsh and unpleasant that they become wrong; and wrong things which are, after all, so jolly that it's hard not to call them right. Why, sometimes I have to stop a fraction of a century myself to reach a decision. It's terribly complicated. The problem is infinite. No mere man, quick or dead, has any right to be dogmatic about it."

"Come, come," said Dr. Straton, and now there was nothing but anger in his voice, "I've heard all those devilish arguments before. When I came here I thought you were God and that this was Heaven. I know now that there's been a mistake. God is no mollycoddle."

He turned on his heel and started to walk away before he remembered that he was a Southern gentleman as well as a clergyman and bowed stiffly, once. Then he went to the edge of the kingdom and jumped. Where he landed it would be hard to say. Only a carefully trained theologian could tell.

Contributors to This Issue

BERTRAND RUSSELL, British scholar, mathematician, philosopher, was conspicuous during the war for his pacifism and suffered imprisonment in his conflict with the authorities. His adherence to radical economic doctrines was set forth in his recent book "Roads to Freedom."

ALLEN MCCURDY is one of the leaders in the Committee of 48 movement.

HEYWOOD BROUN is the literary and dramatic critic of the New York Tribune.

MARY AUSTIN is a well-known western novelist and student of primitive North American literature.

NORMAN HAPGOOD, American journalist and publicist, was formerly United States Ambassador to Denmark.

WILLIAM DUNCAN is a Washington newspaperman versed in Latin-American affairs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New York: Dictator of American Criticism

By MARY AUSTIN

EVER since, in 1914, we turned, with a first faint sense of dereliction, an inquiring eye on our national consciousness, there has been a steady output of books about American writing and American thinking. That at least is what one would conclude from a list of the titles. But an examination of the contents of such books proves that the greater number of them are about what a small New York group thinks ought to be written and thought.

Against our hundred million the smallness of the group stands out; the list of authors is shorter than the titles, for in the past six or seven years some of them have found it necessary to express themselves twice. There are a few detached, academic studies from men attached to universities, and the rest are from young New Yorkers, all under forty, in one case under thirty. Evidently there is something in our American temperament which is complaisant to the immature point of view, or we do not take criticism seriously enough to make it worth while for men of mature years to devote their time to it.

And this immaturity of view is apparent not only in the books but in the periodicals devoted primarily to criticism; youth and the pastime of youth, the building up of criteria of criticism in cliques and groups. There is a notable disposition of the critics towards election among themselves, towards the badge and gesture of augury. But even where the groups differentiate, they exhibit a common derivation from New York.

Something more is indicated here than the natural concentration of literary workers around the publishing trade centers. Most of the criticism which rises to book publication has had its turn in London, or even in Paris. But a very little inquiry reveals that its authors have never lived west of Broadway or north of Fifty-ninth. There are even editors of magazines devoted to the development of the literary consciousness in America who have never held it to be an indispensable condition of their work that they should know something outside of New York. All this, of course, without prejudice; it is simply that nothing outside New York has presented itself to them as being worth knowing.

Under these conditions criticism in America is urban—citified to a degree not approximated by the urbanity of London or Paris. English writers have homes in the country along with the significant members of their audience. Paris is the capital of a homogeneous people. But New York is, in respect to the rest of our country, only a half-way house of immigration, a little less than a half-way house for European thinking. The preponderance of the foreign-born or foreignly derived among our self-constituted literary mentors partly accounts for their detachment from the vast extra-Manhattan territory. Criticism is the natural resort of half knowledge; with an active intelligence and a City College degree one may go far in a milieu which poses a total ignorance of the American process as the best qualification for classifying its product.

Recently in a London journal one of these young critics had fun with the general movement of non-New York American writers to absorb into their work the aboriginal, top layer of literary humus through which characteristically national American literature, if we are ever to have it, must take root. He succeeded in making it appear that it appeared to him ridiculous. But no English critic, supposing one to arise so ignorant of the true processes of national literature, could get space for ridiculing the aboriginal roots of Shakespeare or Yeats. One suspects that the New Yorker is only admitted to the making of an exhibitional ass of himself because it flatters the English concept of our being still a colonial dependency. The point of our departure from such a state would be marked by our ceasing to celebrate half mythical Irish kings in Celtic measures, and by our beginning to handle our American material in generic American metrics.

One wonders what part is played in this schism between literature and the process of nationalization by the preponderance of Jews among our critical writers. There is nothing un-American in being a Jew; it is part of our dearest tradition that no derivation from any race or religion inhibits a contribution to our national whole. We could not without serious loss subtract the Jewish contribution from our science or our economics, or dispense with the services of the younger Jewish publishers. It is only when the Jew attempts the role of interpreter of our American expression that the validity of the racial bias comes into question. Can the Jew, with his profound complex of election, his need of sensuous satisfaction qualifying his every expression of personal life, and his short pendulum-swing between mystical orthodoxy and a sterile ethical culture—can he become the commentator, the arbiter, of American art and American thinking?

One of the books on my list, in the attempt to do just this, answers, without suspecting it, the question. In "Our America" Waldo Frank gives us what must be—since it is an America unguessed of the average American—the country of the intellectual affiliations of his group.

It is a country centered in New York, with a small New England ell in the rear and a rustic gazebo in Chicago; the rest of it is magnificently predicated from a car window. There is some excellent matter in the book concerning Puritanism and pioneers, which, since these are the only elements collated and partly digested by other minds, are the only elements Mr. Frank sees as contributing to our national character. There is interesting, discriminating comment on the New England writers, especially such of them as are already dead. The rest of the book is chiefly concerned with Mr. Frank's own coterie and those outside writers who have done selected work. This includes the younger Chicago group, Sandburg, Anderson, Masters, and Dreiser. Two women are mentioned as having stimulated American thought; they are Amy Lowell and Emma Goldman. There is also a footnote somewhere in the book admitting the existence of other poets and critics, and "several novelists." And in New York there are Mr. Frank's friends solemnly engaged in "releasing the soul of America," "organizing an American tradition which shall . . . bring to birth an articulated people," "quite simply . . . creating a consciousness of American life." The names of these gentlemen are Stieglitz, Stein, Ornstein, Rosenfeld, Oppenheim, Mencken, Littell, Hackett, and Brooks.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Characteristic of the New York attitude toward the vast America of our affections is a chapter on the Southwest stuffed with encyclopedic information about the Aztecs, who never occupied the territory of the United States, and some superficial observations of Pueblo Indians. It is totally void of any reference to such writers as Fewkes, Hodges, Lumholtz, Lummis, Cather, Mathews, Cushing, and Alice Fletcher. Yet the debt of American literature to Washington Mathews and Frank Cushing has no parallel in Europe, unless it be Germany's debt to the Grimm Brothers, or England's to Malory. And it is impossible to get the general relation of the work of Masters, Sandburg, and Anderson to American life without some understanding of the work of Alice Fletcher, which preceded theirs by some years.

This utter blankness to the sources of form and social inspiration is equally apparent in nearly all the comment of New York magazines devoted to the same high, self-descried mission of pointing American genius the way it should go, the same studied neglect of any indication of the way it may be going.

One of them, whose very name dedicates it to our native newness, gives 73 per cent of a year's reviewing space to non-American matter. This leaves out of account about 10 per cent of the whole space where the name of the author was unfamiliar to me and neither the review nor the publisher's announcement furnished any clue to the book's derivation. One knows, in the absence of such indices, that Thorstein Veblen is an American, and that there is no hall-mark of nationality to the sociological abstractions which he so competently handles. But why should a story by Zona Gale be so reviewed that the uninitiate reader does not know whether it happened in Wisconsin or in Senegambia—since the important contribution that Miss Gale has to make is the delimitation of life in the small American community? And is the distinction between two such poets as Louis Untermeyer and Alfred Noyes vested solely in the differences of their respective literary endowments? Is not there a great deal to be said about the distinctions which arise from one's being the product of an almost cloistral English university and the other's being the well-found, smartly schooled, urban American? Surely, if writing and the criticism of writing is to become an aid to that development of the American consciousness to which the New York critic is devoted, some relating of the work to its generating sources is indispensable. It is the absence of such feeling, grounded on ignorance of anything that the book might be related to, which gives to the New York magazine review the fructifying power of a dried specimen in a herbarium, and which accounts for the rise in importance and popularity of the newspaper Sunday Supplement review section. For newspapers are obliged to treat books as news, and news they are, if of nothing but the poverty of man's invention, and good news, whatever they contain, to the extent of their capacity to express, and so in turn to affect, our living.

To the American writer who happens not to be of the New York elect, the ascendancy of the provincial New York reviewer is a deep exasperation. Vain our search for the American form if in the end we are to be judged without any reference to the forces in American life out of which such a form should spring. And how, in hours of indecision, are we to trust to criteria which have already proved themselves to be burrs in the tail of our American Pegasus?

Take, for example, the movement toward what is styled free verse, which is loudly acclaimed by New York to have risen upon the American scene since 1912 under the patronage of Miss Lowell. As early as 1904 we were discussing it in the English Club at Stanford University and were linking it by the help of the Japanese students there with its genetic Oriental source. Many experiments were tried, and two plays that I know of in this medium actually were produced, one of them in New York as early as 1911, though it was written five years earlier. And so utterly dropped at the tail of events was New York criticism of the time that the publishers insisted for the first publication of one of these plays that the lines should be written to simulate prose as a protection against urban obtuseness.

Then there was the movement represented in New York by the Provincetown Players. Practically every experiment tried by them can be found in the annals of the Little Country Theater of North Dakota. Even now there is arising in another part of the country that new metrical medium, based on intrinsic American rhythms, which William Archer long ago predicted as indispensable to the reestablishment of poetic drama. But what New York critic has heard of it?

At a recent convention of community enterprises at Washington it was made clear that the United States will no longer accept the dominance of New York in recreation, in communal ritual and celebration, in music as an element of community life, or in painting. The centralization of publishing trades in and around Manhattan alone makes it possible for New York to assume the postures of literary leadership which it has actually forfeited so far as the genuinely native product is concerned. It would seem, if decentralization is the only way to accomplish the release of the American genius, that decentralization must inevitably take place. New York criticism—we have the critics' own word for it—intends the best in the world by America. It can hardly escape their notice much longer that America begins to be possessed of a definite intention toward New York.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter was a little shocked when Upton Sinclair brought out "The Profits of Religion." In the first place it sounded irreverent—even blasphemous. Then the Drifter has grown up in a suburban parish near one of our largest cities where the rector earned—and still earns—a precarious nine hundred dollars a year. Remembering this, the Drifter thought that he could give Mr. Sinclair some valuable hints as to the profits to be made in the ministerial profession. Now, however, he is not quite so sure. In his Sunday newspaper, which the Drifter reads more religiously than his Bible—as every good Christian, 100-per-cent American should—he finds the following remarkable statement:

> The Parish of Trinity Church has just issued its Year Book and Register. . . . The financial situation of the corporation showed improvement. . . . The income from real estate was $1,031,228 and from interest $19,327. The total income of the corporation was $1,101,766.

The report goes on to emphasize the attention attracted to the church in England, Canada, and Australia by declaring the pews free to all! And there is an appendix to the Year Book giving an account of the visit of the Archbishop

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of York in April, 1918, and of the Prince of Wales last November, when "he attended a special service and occupied the same pew in which his grandfather sat when as Prince of Wales he visited this country in 1860."

The word which had puzzled the Drifter in the report, he now realizes, was not misused. It was fitting to write up the finances of Trinity, its income, and its noted visitors exactly as one would any other "corporation." And as such, the Drifter now looks upon the Temple of Wall Street as he passes it going up Broadway. He must also pass Old St. Paul's, which is now part of the Parish of Trinity. And sometimes, when he steals a moment to wander among the old tombstones that are crumbling there, he wonders why a corporation of such wealth cannot spare the cash to keep the old marks in better shape. The gentle, obliterating work of wind and rain the Drifter would not hinder. But he does regret the dirt—not earth, but modern dirt and dust—which has mounted so high against many stones that he cannot read the inscriptions.

Stop here and read as you Pass By,
As you are Now, so Once was I,
As I am Now, so shall you be—

and the next line, which may hold the secret of all eternity, is covered up. If the Drifter had an income of $1,101,766 a year he would take better care of the old stones. At least he thinks he would. But then he has never been exposed to the temptation such profit would offer. And he wonders a little, too, what a certain radical young proletarian who drove the money changers from the Temple would do with it—and them—today!

* * * * *

UP to the present time the Drifter has been able to escape the 100 per cent Americanism germ partly through a chronic distaste for such snobbishly high marks, and partly by shutting his ears and eyes to all the propaganda that has been flung around so prodigally in favor of it. But his simple evasions are to avail him no longer. The Interracial Council has prepared reports on "Americanization" which it is ready and anxious to distribute not only for publication in shop bulletins where they may be skipped over, or in posters which do not have to be looked at, but in pay envelope slips! The Drifter has formerly received his modest remuneration with a certain innocent and childish pleasure at the thought that this little David was to wrestle with and conquer, if in a rather incomplete way, the cost-of-living Goliath. But now this harmless diversion is to be denied him, for in the potent and attention-compelling pay envelope are to intrude the means whereby he must become a dutiful citizen, a model householder, a red-blooded, two-fisted, stick-to-itive, thoroughgoing hundred-percenter. Alas for the days when seventy was still a passing mark! Friday can no longer be a red-letter day; it must from now on be red, white, and blue.

* * * * *

DURING the war the Massachusetts branch of the League to Enforce Peace, fearful lest some defense society should suspect that word *peace* of meaning pacifist, had the word *enforce* on its stationery printed in red ink. This practice has been abandoned; but Rumor whispers to the Drifter that the League is to adopt a new motto: *Dictated but not Red.*

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Dictatorship of the—?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After considerable hesitation I am venturing to bring to your attention a statement made recently by Dr. Ettinger, the head of our city schools, relating to the resignation of Dr. Wolfson of the High School of Commerce. I quote from the New York *Times* of July 11:

"I [Dr. Ettinger] am very frank to confess that I dissent most heartily from the basic thesis set up by Principal Wolfson that it is the function of our schools to allow students and teachers to express their belief freely, to meet argument with argument, and not either overtly or covertly to suppress opinions which are held in honesty and in good faith."

As a teacher, and more particularly as one who has an infinite faith in the "democratic idea," it seems to me that this is the most genuinely tragic pronouncement—considering the position and power of the man who said it—in American history. Dr. Ettinger goes on to say, in the interview from which I am quoting, that he believes the Anglo-Saxon point of view should dominate all our teaching and that only the opinions of the majority should be voiced by the teacher. But if he will turn back to the earlier pages of Anglo-Saxon history he will discover that the heart and soul of the crude, but deeply significant, rudiments of self-government which distinguished the Anglo-Saxon community was the moot-hill around which both majority and minority opinions seem to have been voiced freely.

We hear these days a great deal of passionate denunciation —and rightly so—of the so-called "dictatorship of the Proletariat." But does not Dr. Ettinger's thesis presuppose a "dictatorship of the majority"—something quite as vicious and as un-American? Surely the majority must rule in a democracy, but have we fallen so low in our social idealism as to deny the right of the minority to give expression to its opinions? Have we forgotten how often the minority has been right? Can we ever be certain that the majority point of view *is* right as long as it stifles every other point of view but its own? I do not see how we can keep faith with our belief in democracy and in "the American Idea" and deny these truths. And admitting them, I cannot see how, for one instant, we can dare to eliminate from our schools—particularly our High Schools—that free and full discussion of all points of view which must of necessity be a vital part in the preparation of our boys and girls for life in a democratic community.

The Nation has recently expressed a democratic repugnance at the plight of Dr. Wolfson and other forward-minded teachers. But what of the great mass of students of our public schools? Are they to be left to such deliberately prejudiced and un-American leadership as that of Dr. Ettinger and his "system"?

New York, July 14 D. A. LYONS

Children in Need

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For one hundred marks a month ($2.50 at present rate of exchange) the American Church in Munich can keep an under-nourished, semi-tuberculous city child in a vacation colony, where good feeding may bring him back from half-starvation to sound health. It has colonies in the mountains where there is an especially good milk supply, and places many of its children in separate families. It has raised thirty thousand marks for this work, but needs more.

We are hoping that our friends and the friends of humanity will help us to continue our work.

WILLIAM E. NIES
Chairman of the American Church Relief Committee

Munich, June 19

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Summer

By DAVID MORTON

I think these stars that draw so strangely near,
That lean and listen for the turning Earth,
Are never wholly careless when they hear
The murmur of her hushed and quiet mirth—
But looking out upon a world in bloom,
They half-remember, and they heed and hark:
A reminiscent sweetness in the gloom,
A music older than this singing dark.

Their summers gone, so many aeons past,
Bird-song and bloom and swallow from the sky,
These dead, desireless worlds find here, at last,
Something remembered when the Earth turns by,
Sweet with these blowing odors they had known,
This happy music that was once their own.

Books

Bernstorff in America

My Three Years in America. By Count Bernstorff. Charles Scribner's Sons.

AMONG the few things for which the world can be thankful, in this post-war period, is the degree to which the immediate causes of the beginning and prolongation of the Great War are being cleared up without the usual delay in publishing essential papers. For this promptness in publication the complete collapse of the old governments in Germany and Russia is responsible. The Bolsheviki have published one set of documents of first-rate historical importance, and the Germans, quarreling over their responsibilities, have published another. In the second set Count Bernstorff's testimony takes a high place.

The American translation comes at a fortunate time. Not long ago the calm discussion of any German treatise that was loyal to the essential German case would have been impossible in America; but our passions are now being partly drained off in other directions. Count Bernstorff is as simply patriotic about the long-distance causes of the world-conflict as he is severe in his view of German mistakes in diplomacy. It would be too much to expect him to look with unbridled horror upon submarine war while accepting with equanimity a starvation blockade. American readers, therefore, should come to the book prepared to see the author evidently believing that Great Britain was breaking international law as ruthlessly as Germany was; that the German government in 1914 did not desire the war but merely wished to infuse backbone into Austria against Slavic attempts to break her up; and that the treaty of Versailles punishes the German people for the faults of the German government, contrary to Mr. Wilson's promises. If he can stand such differences of opinion, the American reader will find much to give him not only information but satisfaction. He will find a most conclusive condemnation of the conduct of the German foreign office. The evidence is complete that the Government never really wanted peace except on terms of serious gain. Even taking the foreign office fully at its word, the most reasonable proposal it ever considered included a strategic frontier against Russia, strategic rectifications of the French frontier, guarantees from Belgium, colonial restitution, compensation for German losses, and freedom of the seas; in return for all of which Germany was to give nothing except the French territory taken in this war and the little piece of Upper Alsace occupied by her. This determination upon a peace of victory emerges as the real reason for Count Bernstorff's inability to induce his government to accept Wilson's mediation. The truth is that up to the time of Kerensky there was never a moment when any one of the leading governments on either side would have been satisfied with a peace without victory, although Count Bernstorff makes an excellent case for his having himself favored that solution steadfastly from the battle of the Marne. Unless he has kept back documents of importance, which does not seem at all probable, since his enemies in the government could have published them against him, it will become clearer that he had a most realistic appreciation of the forces and considerations involved and a cool and far-seeing desire to save his country from the deadly results of over-confidence.

There is much of popular interest in the Ambassador's observations on our press and our national characteristics. After the manner of bureaucracies Berlin had an over-simplified conception of the American character, deeming it principally commercial, so that Count Bernstorff spent much effort in endeavoring to wake his government up to those traits of sentiment and potential excitement that would surely bring us into the war in the end if the German policy did not change in regard to submarines, statement of war-aims, Belgian deportations, and all matters in which an understanding of our mass characteristics was important. He was entirely helpless, for the time had passed in Germany when the military authorities could be kept in their proper sphere by the civil government as they were in the days of Bismarck, and the military authorities had no more idea of popular psychology in a foreign country than an American trust magnate usually has. Count Bernstorff himself is not a thinker like Norman Angell and Bertrand Russell, but he is intelligent to a high degree, exact, fearless, without cheap pride, living in a much more real atmosphere than most of the German war statesmen. He has the prime advantage, for a time of such complexity, of having a good mind that functions without interference from his prejudices or his passions.

A large part of the book is given up to meeting exaggerated charges in the United States about propaganda and plots, and to setting out in an orderly and complete manner the Lusitania, Arabic, and Sussex incidents; it is probable that these matters retain more interest today for German readers than for those who will read the American translation. More important are his estimates of our statesmen. The fact that our leading public men, including our secretaries of state, speak nothing but English is a matter upon which he puts much emphasis, as he sees clearly the decisive part it plays in affecting our conduct in world-politics. The little sketches of Bryan and Lansing are life-like as far as they go, and he says searching things about Lodge and other leaders whose ultimate thought is fixed in the money centers; but the really full-length impressions are of President Wilson and Colonel House. Amazing objectivity, kindness, wisdom, and unswerving determination at all times and places to keep peace in mind as the one most important consideration, are the high-lights in Colonel House; and this tribute from so balanced and well-informed an observer on the German side does not differ from the impressions of highly competent men in France and England. Morally and intellectually Colonel House has been to America what General Smuts and Lord Robert Cecil have been to England—in the melee yet above it.

The picture of Wilson is fairer than could reasonably be expected from a German writing after the peace of Versailles, but naturally enough it over-emphasizes, in Wilson's change of tone toward the German people, the part played by politics and personal chagrin; and it utterly fails to attach appropriate importance to the President's mastering idea that the formation and launching of a League of Nations was everything: that if in the poker game at Versailles he could get Foch and Clemenceau to give up their full material guaranties and rely for the safety of France on an agreement to which Germany would later become a party, he would accomplish enough to make any concession justifiable.

NORMAN HAPGOOD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Historical Miscellanies

Studies in History and Politics. By Herbert Fisher. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

WHEN the Right Honorable Herbert Fisher took up the onerous duties of a Minister of the Crown on the British Educational Board, it might have been said that an angel had rushed in where some fools, at least, had feared to tread. For once a scholar had something to say about the schools. But the heavy labors in the service of the English youth left him little time for writing and research. The studies collected in his latest volume are, therefore, not new, but are reprints of various magazine articles written, for the most part, between five and ten years ago, though here and there retouched and supplemented. They are all amply worth reading. Three of the eleven essays deal with French politics; three with the history of history; two with Napoleon; one with British Imperial administration; one with the value of small states; and one with the resurgence of Prussia.

The romance of Napoleon's early life is vividly impressed upon the reader of Mr. Fisher's description of Corsica, with its wild scenery, its warlike mountaineers, and its eternal family feuds. When Bonaparte was a youth his spirit was fired by the Revolution. As a Jacobin he was hated by the conservative and separatist Corsicans, who captured him and probably would have put him to death in 1793 but for a mysterious and melodramatic escape. But the hosannas came later. As emperor, Napoleon won his fellow-countrymen to France and is by them worshiped today as no ruler has been worshiped since the days of ancient Rome. When the imperial hymn is sung the Corsicans go down on their knees. Mr. Fisher also points out the main currents of Napoleonic influence in the various nations of Europe. Napoleon is said to have saved the benefits of the Revolution for France and to have extended it to other peoples. Only in England, where he was consistently represented as a charlatan and a vulgar ape of his betters, was his influence reactionary. Elsewhere he has gone down to posterity as he wished, "with his Code in his hand."

Quite fascinating are Mr. Fisher's judgments of other historians. Ammianus Marcellinus wins his sympathy and respect to a high degree, the first because of the melancholy task he had to perform in narrating the story of a collapsing world, the second because of his fairness, accuracy, and honesty. Almost alone in that age of religious struggle he kept a balanced mind and an affable spirit. Very different was another historian, nicely characterized by the author: Lord Acton. The real paradox of this man's nature was not, as has often been said, that he knew so much and produced so little, but that, with his unrivaled knowledge of facts, he should have had so little difficulty in dealing out, as he does, sentences of approval or condemnation to everyone. Superlatives abound in his works: Napoleon is "the most splendid genius that has appeared on earth," the author of the "Imitation" is "the greatest religious writer that ever lived," Robespierre "the most hateful character in the forefront of history since Machiavelli," and so forth. Acton seems to have had the assurance of Providence in assigning men to the election of grace or to damnation, and like Calvin he was sure that the greater part of mankind was doomed to the latter. Almost everyone in authority, he once said, was extremely wicked. This is but one of the paradoxes advanced by Acton which are sure to diminish his somewhat artificial fame. That, as he maintained, the Reformation and the French Revolution were both blows to the cause of liberty, that the South was right in the American Civil War, that the Roman Catholic Church is a progressive force—these are ideas believed by Acton but rejected by the consensus of competent opinion. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*

Fairness and acumen mark Mr. Fisher's treatment of modern German historians. They were all, as he points out, engaged, whatever period they might select as a subject, in writing the history of their own time, if not of the future. Mommsen's Rome was but an ancient Prussia, his Cæsar the prototype of the great German conqueror, the Moltke of 1870, or the greater military genius to come. So with Droysen and Sybel and Treitschke and the rest; they all had in mind the German Empire as it existed and as they hoped it would exist and grow in the future.

How Rousseau deduced history from theory and wrote constitutions entirely unbiased by the facts, how he preached so eccentric a virtue that Dr. Johnson wished to send him to the penal colonies, and how at last his thought has attained its rightful place in political philosophy, is wittily set forth by Mr. Fisher. Not less interesting is his review of Ollivier's "Memoirs" and his conclusion that France wanted war in 1870 no less than did Germany. Most valuable of all is perhaps his chapter on French Nationalism. The leader among those who stimulated the spirit of revenge for 1870 was Déroulède, a man lacking in judgment and balance but abounding in enthusiasm and love of country. The odds against him were heavy. "Young man," said Renan to him, "France is dying; do not trouble her last agony." But he wrote poems and fostered *La Patrie*, that extremely provocative jingo newspaper cried so loudly through the streets of Paris by boys who seem to be always on the run. Though he must often have known of his paper what Danton said of the country—"*La Patrie* est en danger"—he fought the fight to the end, and now, in the ghastly Pyrrhic victory that France is celebrating, he has won his reward.

PRESERVED SMITH

What the Workers Want

What the Workers Want. By Arthur Gleason. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

MR. GLEASON reports contemporary history as a dramatist might compose a pageant. The slow, obscure working of social change, the mass movements only half conscious of their direction and power, the petty failures and slight successes which make up the detail of the march—these things he is conscious of and strives to express, but not as the historian or the scientist. Rather he symbolizes them in the crisis and the hero, conveying the sense of social life in personal terms. Only the most naive supposed that the nationalization of the British coal mines began and ended at the hearings of the Commission under the chairmanship of Justice Sankey. Back of that Commission stretched the long history of the mines and their operation, the slow organization of the men, the welding of the unions into one great Federation, the ferment of ideas expressed by the Fabian, by the industrial unionist, and by the guildsman, the slow spread of labor education, the swift rush of enlightenment incidental to the war and its consequences, and the industrial evolution of mine operation itself. Ahead of it loom years of breaches of faith by the government, negotiations, dickerings, and strikes, political campaigns and elections, and the sabotage of workers on one side and private capital on the other. Yet Mr. Gleason contrives to make two chapters on the Coal Commission give us a hint of the whole process. He shows us the managers, statisticians, and landed peers passing in defeat under the guns of Robert Smillie, Sidney Webb, Frank Hodges, Sir Leo Chiozza Money, and R. H. Tawney, all of them distinguished not only as personalities but as types also. He gives us a keen sense of the dramatic impact of the moment. Through a few passages quoted from the testimony and cross-examination he reveals the breakdown of the hereditary private ownership of an industry, the glacier-like advance of 800,000 miners, as vanguard of the nation's labor, over the inhumanities and inequalities of capitalist society.

So also it is neither as a theoretician nor as a critic that Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gleason speaks of the British unions or the Labor Party. He goes to the congress of the one at Glasgow and the conference of the other at Southport, and with an assessing eye pictures them in talk and in action. Most of the important leaders appear, from Smillie and Hodges at the left to Clynes and Tom Shaw on the right. There is no attempt to create an artificial uniformity out of such a large and varied group, but a sense of unity emerges. Mr. Gleason seems to have the dramatist's aversion to saying anything out of his own mouth. He sets the stage, describes the *dramatis personae*, and juxtaposes their significant utterances. The result gives an effect of authentic composition. This method succeeds even with the railway strike and with the chapters which show the quaint British method of "gentle revolution." It reaches its climax in the valuable section completely written by men like Frank Hodges of the Miners, J. T. Murphy of the Shop Steward movement, and C. T. Cramp of the Railwaymen. It is reflected in the title of the book.

This intimate and participating vision should have a wholesome effect upon that large group of Americans who, while captivated by the dramatic and the external in the British labor movement, have failed to regard its American counterpart with more than a cold and distant sympathy. It is easy to take the phrase for the reality, especially at a distance. How many have not innocently assumed that the Nottingham reconstruction program of the British Labor Party sprang like a song from the pure heart of a Percival-like multitude while the cautious and ungenerous sentences of Gompers represented a contrasting ugliness of soul on the part of our unionists? There is a gulf between the two movements, to be sure, but no such gulf as this simple assumption implies. The British unions have had their distressing fissures, their frailties of spirit, their heavy-footed conservatives as well as the American. Like any movement composed of millions of human beings, the British was slow in coming to the issue, and it still is likely to disappoint sorely those whose quick enthusiasm was aroused, without sufficient understanding, by anticipation of a prompt and certain victory. It reached its present stage only through the constant loyalty of those who were willing to meet a hundred rebuffs, willing to be patient with many errors, willing to study in detail and with humility as members of the intellectual rank and file. A book of this sort was not needed to increase the prestige of British labor. It was needed to make us feel its reality, to warn us against too exigent expectations, and to hint of a better use of its strength in this country.

As is usual with Mr. Gleason's books, not the least valuable part of "What the Workers Want" is the bulky appendix, containing documents of the mining inquiry, the Whitley Councils, early British Socialism, and the like.

GEORGE SOULE

Woman

Woman. By Magdeleine Marx. Introduction by Henri Barbusse. Translated by Adele S. Seltzer. Thomas Seltzer.

Open the Door. By Catherine Carswell. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

WHAT do these women want? A wise, rather cool American lady, herself remote enough from these ardors and rebellions, tells us: "There is a great deal of suffering among women, especially the women—both unmarried and married—of the middle classes. There are lives so repressed and so poverty-stricken or else so wrenched and maladjusted that one wonders there is not more open revolt and violence. These women just wither away in mind as well as in body. It is a painful and tragic sight." Your stern moralist has his reply ready: "They must resign themselves and do their duty." The trouble is that he misses a distinction. Those who can resign themselves do. Genuine resignation means the subduing of one's desires and one's will into harmony with one's condition in life. Most of these women are not intellectual; they are neither rebels nor reformers. They would ask nothing better than the ability to be resigned and calm. But how about those—an ever increasing number—who cannot achieve resignation? Our stern moralist will try to meet the situation with vague phrases about the nobility of suffering and its chastening power. Here one must bid him halt. Suffering of that kind hardly tends to ennoble the soul. Has he ever seen these women, with their pitiful false graces and furtive looks and drained souls and terror of the years to come, at teas and lectures? And chastening? Why should one be chastened? For what fault? What sin? Why?

In some such way one could state, deliberately using terms and a tone of moderation, the spiritual background of both "Woman" and "Open the Door." And it is not without significance to add that "Woman" has been welcomed with an almost strident enthusiasm by the great liberals of Europe—Barbusse and Rolland, Brandes and Stefan Zweig and Bertrand Russell, and that "Open the Door" has received in Great Britain a rather important prize reserved for first novels. Somehow these books seem to speak out a burning and open secret and to answer to a broad and vital need.

The protest of both Madame Marx and Miss Carswell is, as Barbusse points out in his preface to "Woman," a protest against the "exclusiveness of love" and also, one may add, against the falsely idealistic assumption of its necessary continuance. The theory of exclusiveness derives in man, of course, from the deep-rooted sense of property which ages of open or concealed slave-holding have left in him; in woman it derives from the anxiety, especially natural in northern or densely settled countries, to secure for herself and her children the entire labor of the bread-giver. The theory of the necessary continuance of love in marriage is, contrary to the common opinion, a romantic fiction of comparatively recent origin. Now, the origin of neither notion invalidates it, but does raise in each case the legitimate question: Is it, after all, conformable to human nature today? For that is the test we must ultimately apply. It is the test which, with whatever emotional reluctance, man has always applied. Had he not done so, we should all, it is clear, still be obeying the tribal taboos of our remotest ancestors, which were all venerable in their day and seemed lovely and of good report to comfortable middle-aged people who had adjusted themselves and were both proud of it and loth to change.

These apparently non-literary considerations are not at all out of place. The conservative press has already begun its snickering and flippant campaign against both "Woman" and "Open the Door." And it is humiliating to consider that America should have but a sneer or an empty moral gesture for books that stir the best minds of Europe. To call the unnamed heroine of Madame Marx or Miss Carswell's Joanna Bannerman immoral is the cheapest shirking of one of the very vital issues that confront civilization.

When we come to the actual intellectual and artistic texture of the two books, it is a little difficult to understand the great praise that great wits have lavished on "Woman." The story is frank and sincere and full of isolated perceptions that are both searching and beautiful. But it is also thin and scrappy and disjointed, and the complete shadowiness of all the characters robs its theories of the inner energy of a human content. We see neither the woman's husband nor her lover nor, in any clear manner, herself. We gather that her husband understood the necessities of her nature without feeling them, and that her lover neither felt nor understood them. Nothing in all the book is as vividly seen and communicated as the description of the poor mothers at the hospital, and that is but an illustrative incident, though, as such, most pertinent and striking. In a word, Madame Marx has felt very deeply and reflected intensely, and those who agreed with her passionately have taken it for granted that she has written a great book. But that is taking for granted far too much.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Open the Door" is a much longer book and, as a matter of fact, a much better one. It is far more concrete and therefore far more philosophical, too. The Glasgow life described in it is thick, solid, and intense at once. The quietly and yet so admirably done full-length portrait of Juley Bannerman and the facts of her marriage throw a steady stream of full and mellow light on the nature and adventures of Joanna. No less illuminating are the various incidents of Joanna's childhood and early girlhood. These really add to the important and hitherto unrecorded facts of our moral nature. And Joanna's great discovery seems to us more fundamental than any made by the heroine of Madame Marx. It is the discovery that what "in the Christian sense" is "evil" in her contributes no less than what is "good" to "make her alive" and an individual and a truly human being. One may quarrel with the probability of some of the adventures through which she vindicates the wholeness of her nature. She and her story remain vivid and delightful and have a touch of epic breadth and richness.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Books in Brief

MEN in love, said Balzac, are like apes trying to play the violin. But primitive men, it may be added, have more than laughter from their fellows to instruct them in the subject which, with food-getting, is their greatest concern. They have puberty rituals and initiations and a candid and understood symbolism in their tribal arts. As with the increase of civilization the complexity of love increases one might reasonably expect an accompanying advance in the science and the craft. Instead, the instrument has come to be as intricate as a violin while the average lover has little opportunity to know more about it than would suffice to beat a tomtom. Doctors in the science are urged, even compelled, to keep their learning to themselves; laymen are left in an ignorance abominably enforced by the dogma that there are two loves, that of the spirit and that of the body, and that the two have no imperative connection. Theologically speaking, the one is therefore regarded as the heaven and the other the hell of the matter; speaking socially, the one is regarded as the respectable neighborhood and the other as the slums. William J. Fielding in his valuable "Sanity in Sex" (Dodd, Mead) attacks this dangerous dualism at every point where its evil consequences appear. There may be difficulties in finding suitable methods for instructing the young in sex, but they are as nothing in comparison with the disasters which result from the furtive and often filthy misinstruction which the young are sure to obtain from one another if they have no better sources. From such ignorance proceeds no small part of the hideous flood of venereal disease, economic disability, conjugal discontent, and repressions and perversions and cruelties without number. Mr. Fielding is not an alarmist; he strikes more than a note of hope in his account of the work which the United States Government did with the army during the war and which various governmental and private agencies plan to carry on in peace. It was time for some such awakening. According to reports of the Surgeon General for the period from September 21 to December 7, 1917, the computed annual rate of admission for venereal disease for each thousand men was 121.9, while the total rate a thousand for pneumonia, dysentery, typhoid, paratyphoid, malaria, meningitis, and scarlet fever was 25.7. Appalling as this is, it was matched by the ignorance which everywhere prevailed with regard to all sexual affairs, and which merely reflected the state of knowledge and opinion among the people at large, where millions of men for lack of information believe that all of sex is comprised in a stealthy function, and millions of women, married and unmarried, believe that frigidity is a virtue. Specifically Mr. Fielding argues for a sane enlightenment carried on under public auspices; for a scientific promotion of the practice of birth control; for a wider knowledge of the light which psychoanalysis throws on the sexual question; and of course for that economic reconstruction without which nothing permanent can be accomplished. These, however, he understands and intelligently argues, all depend upon a change in the general conception. The tragedy will go on until it is recognized that love *is* sexual love, that the milder affections are also of the flesh, and that desire is also of the soul.

IN a slighter work bearing upon the same theme C. Gasquoine Hartley (Mrs. Walter Gallichan) discusses "Women's Wild Oats" (Stokes). The war, she points out, in releasing and redirecting the energies of many women in England created a new problem for English society. Having had more freedom than before, women are unwilling to go back to their old status; how, then, shall a new balance between the sexes be arrived at? Mrs. Gallichan, who regards marriage as not a romantic exercise but a racial duty, asks that divorce in England be made as free as marriage, that prostitution be no more encouraged or winked at in the body of the state than cancer in that of the individual, that illegitimate children be given by the state as nearly as possible the advantages which legitimate children are given by their parents, and that some sort of recognition be allowed to "passionate friendships" formed out of wedlock—a point on which she does not make quite clear the superiority of such an acknowledged concubinage to a marriage capable of being dissolved by mutual consent. Summed up, her arguments are for a plain admission of the relations now existing between men and women in England in the hope that by admitting them the authorities may do away with the shabby hypocrisies and sneaking license which make the existing statutes grotesque. Undoubtedly the Parliament of Lloyd George will do nothing half so thorough, but it is not unconsoling to lovers of Great Britain to see that some of its publicists, at least in their proposals, are abreast of the steps already taken by the law in Scandinavia.

THE bibliography of Paris is immense. For centuries the life and charms of the French capital, "fair, fantastic Paris," have been celebrated in prose and verse. It is with a feeling, therefore, of mild curiosity as to what more could possibly be said that one opens "Paris Vistas" by Helen Davenport Gibbons (Century). After recovering from the shock of "a bang-up dinner," "the old wop," "the old buck," "when I was a kid," and certain intimate revelations of family life, one becomes gradually fascinated by the good nature and warm heart of the writer; and certain aspects of life in Paris, especially during the war, assume a vividness not easily forgotten. The book is a story of Paris as experienced in girlhood and later married life. Mrs. Gibbons stayed in the city with her four children through the war while her husband was absent for months at a time as a newspaper correspondent. She says: "France was saved because Paris led a normal life in the midst of the whirlwind. The Turks have a proverb that a fish begins to corrupt at its head. If the Parisians had given up the struggle to live tranquilly France would have been lost." The normality of existence might have been questioned, as a matter of fact, at a time when no coal or wood was obtainable and the dining-room chairs and table were chopped up for fuel to warm the room of a sick baby in order to save its life.

THE Oxford Junior Scientific Club heard, on November 17, 1919, a remarkably interesting lecture by Arthur Keith, now republished under the title "Nationality and Race from the Anthropologist's Point of View" (Oxford University Press). Properly speaking, "race" is the only subdivision of the human species recognized by the anthropologist; "nationality" is a political, not a biological distinction. Regarding the first distinction as natural and the latter as artificial, the anthropologist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is apt to charge all the woes of mankind to a conflict of inherited instincts with acquired habits. Certainly there are few problems more serious at present than those presented by the adjustment of racial relations in America, Africa, and Australasia. The "lesser breeds" show remarkable differences of vitality; whereas some die away at the first touch of civilization, others propagate "after taking" at a rate equal to that maintained by them before taking the white man's medicine. Thus, extensive hybridization results; it has been carried farthest in South America, but seems to be slowly gaining ground in North America and South Africa. Compared to the vast problems raised by race, Dr. Keith regards those of nationality as easy and trivial. Indeed, the point of his lecture is largely in the application of it to the case of Ireland. He is at great pains to show that there is no Irish race; and he therefore implies that there should be no Irish problem. If British scientists could only persuade the misguided Irish that when, in the past centuries, the Sassanachs made their lives a hell, it was nothing but a little family tiff, would not everything be immediately and beautifully settled?

STORIES of the settlement of Kentucky grow as naturally as bluegrass and as tall as hemp. Most of them are mere tales of adventure, but Mr. Archibald Henderson in "The Conquest of the Old Southwest . . . 1740-1790" (Century) has brought in family piety and economic interpretation. His piety serves to enlarge the fame of Judge Richard Henderson, founder of Transylvania, and his economic interpretation adds stability to the romantic motives ordinarily stressed in the elder narratives. Writing from North Carolina and with the new material which North Carolina has lately been assembling, Mr. Henderson particularly exhibits the contribution of that State to the old Southwest. He emphasizes, too, such frontier experiments in government as Watauga and Transylvania and Franklin—all promising commonwealths in their day—and brings the account down through Kings Mountain to the day when Tennessee, "after a romantic and arduous struggle, finally passed through the wide-flung portals into the domain of national statehood." Perhaps it is no wonder that with a theme so stirring Mr. Henderson's style should so often swell, even in a solid and shrewd historical monograph; but it is none the less a pity. Though the first Kentuckians were saga-men, their epic has always been colored with romance.

MODESTLY following in the footsteps of McMaster and Rhodes, who have made such excellent use of the newspaper and pamphlet as indexes to contemporary public opinion, Miss Margaret Woodbury has made a study of "Public Opinion in Philadelphia during the Federalist period, 1789-1801" (Smith College Studies in History, V, Nos. 1, 2), in which she has attempted to discover what men wrote about to the newspapers of the time. She has worked through a great mass of literature and has arranged her material in orderly fashion, describing the papers and their editors, and making abundant quotations designed to show the range of the Philadelphia mind. She finds, as was to be expected, that most of the questions of the day—finance, foreign relations, political candidates, issues, parties, titles and insignia, disease and its remedies—were debated at length, in language frequently more acrimonious than profitable; the labor problem rarely if ever appeared. Miss Woodbury's conclusions are not always important, but occasionally her extracts are interesting. The following quotation, were it read out of its setting, would seem to cover a present day situation. "The history of the present administration proves that there is no measure, however odious to you or repugnant to your constitution, which the authority of a President cannot accomplish." This was written of the administration of George Washington in 1796.

ALFRED · A · KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

Latest Importations

THE EVOLUTION OF AN INTELLECTUAL
By John Middleton Murry
Editor of The Athenaeum (London)
A series of essays, covering the period of the war, whose range is from Tolstoy to Lloyd George, from Russia to Democracy and Patriotism. $3.00

OCTOBER and Other Poems
By Robert Bridges
"A lovely and noble addition to Mr. Bridges' work as a poet."—*The Westminster Gazette* (London). $1.50

JEWISH CHILDREN
By Shalom Aleichem
Stories by the greatest of modern Yiddish writers dealing with the life of children in the villages of the Russian pale. Translated by Hannah Berman. $2.00

WORDSWORTH: An Anthology
Edited by T. J. Cobden-Sanderson
"This beautiful book, of tall pages, generous margins, and delightful type, will certainly become a treasured possession of many Wordsworthians, and, given by them to others, will bring converts to the faith."—*London Times.*
Only 250 copies for America. $3.00

Mr. Knopf's Fall Announcement

is now ready and will be mailed to *any one on request. In it thirty-three* interesting books are described, among them volumes by

Joseph Hergesheimer
Willa Cather
Max Beerbohm
H. L. Mencken
W. Somerset Maugham
W. H. Hudson
Floyd Dell
Carl Van Vechten
Sidney L. Nyburg

Economic Reprints

"Alfred Knopf has put students of social affairs in his debt by republishing in pocket-size volumes the autobiographies of Robert Owen and of William Lovett. That of Owen covers a very eventful life, and one of first importance in the history of Socialism, labor, and cooperation, and is the expression of an unusual personality."—*New York Evening Post.*

I. THE LIFE OF ROBERT OWEN
By Himself. With an introduction by M. Beer, author of "A History of British Socialism." ($1.50)

II-III. THE LIFE AND STRUGGLES OF WILLIAM LOVETT
The autobiography of a great labor leader who organized the Chartist movement in England. (Two vols. $3.00)

IV. THE PIONEERS OF LAND REFORM
Essays by Thomas Paine ("Agrarian Justice"); William Ogilvie ("The Right of Property in Land"); and Thomas Spence (Nationalization of the Land"). ($1.50)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IF literature is not cosmopolitan when a Japanese-German publishes in the United States in English a book dealing with the life of the great Jew whose deeds and doctrines, recounted in the Greek of the Gospels, serve as the basis of the Christian religion, when is it? Sadakichi Hartmann's "The Last Thirty Days of Christ" (privately printed) will sound to the orthodox a good deal like George Moore for irreverence and a little like Anatole France for slyness. Ostensibly the diary of the disciple Lebbeus, also called Thaddeus, it explains the miracles as so many quite rational affairs and ends with Jesus dying like a mortal man in a garden at Emmaus; in the most realistic language it shows Lebbeus asking Jesus if he is to "swipe" the ass on which the Master entered Jerusalem, describing the shapely legs of the Samaritan woman, and recounting with vigor and gusto the pranks of the dusty, naked apostles in the Jordan. Bull-necked Peter, "fierce, stubborn, easily roused, but devoted to the Master like no other"; "flamboyant Judas Iscariot, a strangely magnetic personality"; "sturdy, straightforward James and sad and headachy-looking John"—John being the Boswell of the expedition; doubting Thomas, "a lean elderly crab-apple sort of a man"; "old 'muffled-up' Bartholomew, of whose face at no time one could see more than a sniveling nose"; Mathew, "practical, shrewd, determined that something great must be the outcome of all this personal discomfort and marching about"—these and the others are keenly drawn to what may have been the life—of course no one knows. The apostles talk metaphysics behind the Master's back and undertake plans for "something great." Indeed, the betrayal appears as merely Judas's scheme for bringing matters to a head and forcing Jesus to call on the "legion of angels" which he had said he could command. Alas, the apostles could not comprehend their Teacher, his humor, his paradoxes, his hyperboles, his strength in tenderness, his nature so rich and full that he could be ascetic without drying up. He stands in this book, wherein the arguments of Renan are made flesh, as a companionable saint—not a god at all—who is still marked off from the intensely human group about him by a mystery and a glory which are Sadakichi Hartmann's tribute to his power and which, in Christian art, have been symbolized by the bright aureole round his head.

LAST year M. Louis Thomas made a visit to the Northern, Eastern, and Southern parts of the United States with the hope of carrying back with him suggestions as to how his enfeebled nation might enlist American help in getting back her vigor and prosperity. Though for the most part a dispassionate study of industrial and commercial facts and figures, his book, "Les Etats-Unis Inconnus" (Paris: Perrin), breathes sadness. Always restrained and polite, always outspoken in admiration of American skill and intelligence, M. Thomas, who feels that there should have been some distribution of the war debt among all the Allies, warns his countrymen that the only considerable assistance they can now expect from the great Western republic will take the form of loans bearing a substantial rate of interest; unless in addition—and he sees in this possibility the brightest hope for France—American experts can be induced to go over and become active partners in remunerative reconstruction enterprises. Thus a few men with a genius like Henry Ford's for multiplying production would be worth more to the French than billions of dead assets. Or, to consider a particular and a very promising field for French industrial activity, since the French lead the world in furniture-designing but are backward in the machinery of manufacture and distribution, if certain Grand Rapids makers were to aid in the transformation of a convenient Atlantic port or two, say La Rochelle or Saint-Nazaire, into great furniture building and shipping centers, breaking up the formal and antiquated business procedure of the French and introducing the straightforward and rapid methods of the new West, France and the world would be greatly the gainers. M. Thomas, on the whole, finds our republic attractive as well as efficient.

Russian Policy vs. Russian News

Has American journalism dealt squarely with the facts about Russia? Or has the editorial wish that things were different in Russia colored and distorted the news of how things are in Russia?

The Test of the News

by Walter Lippmann and Charles Merz

is a 48-page Supplement to The New Republic of August 4th which gives the results of an unbiased analysis of the Russian news of the New York *Times* from March, 1917 to March, 1920.

On all newsstands 15 cents a copy or direct from

The New Republic
421 West 21st Street New York City

Twenty years of struggle, setback and reward; the conception and birth of a new industrial relationship, amid the fumes of the melting-pot.

THE
NEW UNIONISM
IN THE CLOTHING INDUSTRY

by

J. M. Budish and George Soule

The dramatic story of the clothing-workers' progress from the sweat-shop to a commanding position in organized labor.

With bibliography and appendix, $3.00.

Just ready

HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE, 1 W. 47th ST. NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Strike-Breaking in the Canal Zone

By WILLIAM DUNCAN

SILVER roll employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad have recently, it is reported, received increases in pay. The news may not appear of much significance, but in view of the tactics employed during February and March to break a strike of those employees, the matter is at least of interest.

Silver roll employees are Negroes—mostly Jamaicans and other West Indians. Many of them are capable workmen, performing work of quite as important a character as some of the white employees. The Negroes, however, are paid in silver, and the whites in gold; and the difference does not stop here, for although the white workmen are paid wages comparing very favorably with those in the United States—in many instances being even higher—the colored men are fortunate to get as much as $52.50 a month.

A strike of the silver employees had threatened before February 16, when the men presented their demands to Governor Chester Harding. In a statement three days later they presented a tabulation of the needs of a single man for actual subsistence which, they showed, required an expenditure of $38.07 a month. For a family, they contended, twice as much should be available—$76.15—yet they asked only a wage of $57.11 a month, or 27 cents an hour. The men received no satisfaction nor even attention from Governor Harding, and on February 24 they walked out. Hospital employees and workers at military posts were exempted from the strike order, but some 15,000 to 17,000 silver employees threw down tools.

The Governor's reply was an order that all silver employees who were not back at work by February 26 would be considered as having resigned, and would "be deprived of canal quarters after that date. Rents will be reimbursed corresponding to the unexpired portion of the month."

The "fourteen points" of the workers were made known on the same day. The most important of these called for an increase in pay of 7 cents an hour; equal pay for men and women doing the same kind of work; an eight-hour day; time and a half for overtime; five days' notice on leaving work, or of discharge; no discharges "on account of reduction of force," with replacement by other workers. The Governor answered that he would not enter into any agreement, written or otherwise, with a committee of employees concerning rates of pay or conditions of employment. "These matters can be fixed only by administrative order, subject to change by the same authority." He said, however, that adjustments of wages to living costs would be made, "in accordance with the policy adopted," four times during the year.

Evictions of the strikers began promptly on schedule time, but certain landlords in San Miguel and elsewhere decided to rent vacant houses and rooms only to dispossessed silver employees, and to collect no rents until the strike was settled. The gold employees of the canal—the whites—showed little sympathy with the efforts of the silver workers to obtain a living wage, however, as is illustrated by the following statement from the Panama *Star and Herald:*

The night service of the canal telephone department was not interfered with in the least by the failure of the silver operatives to report for duty. The shifts were so arranged by the officials of the department to work the girls twenty-four hours a day instead of under the old day and night shifts. The girls who volunteered for the work found it quite a novelty and no complaints have been made by them.

The Hon. A. Percy Bennett, the British Minister, offered to mediate. The strikers still remained out practically in a body; but R. J. Alvaro and E. Hazera, two officials of the Republic of Panama, made it known that the republic wanted nothing to do with the evicted strikers on the ground that they might become public charges. When the strikers endeavored to go from the Canal Zone into Panama, their goods were held at the border for payment of duty. The canal government then offered them transportation to Los Cascades camp until repatriation to Jamaica or elsewhere could be arranged for them. The strikers were even allowed to leave their goods in the zone, provided they marked them plainly. As a result of the British Minister's well-meaning attempts in behalf of the King's Jamaican subjects, Governor Harding relented sufficiently to say that the silver roll workers might go back to work on the old terms, if they went at once. The Panama *Star's* issue of March 1 asserted that 98 per cent of the strikers actually preferred repatriation to returning to work at the old wage rate. Meanwhile, the gold employees waited on Governor Harding to urge that "many jobs formerly filled by aliens . . . should belong to American citizens."

The strike theoretically ended at midnight, March 3, although most of the men were still out. William P. Stoute, the leader of the strikers, asked naturalization in Panama, but the Sub-Secretary of Foreign Affairs—the same Mr. Hazera who had aided in breaking the strike by his efforts to keep the evicted families out of Panama—advised against it. The strikers were not only beaten but disillusioned, for they had confidently counted on help from their union in the United States, to which, they said, they had sent $100,000 gold; but their appeals for assistance were unanswered.

The following official statements by the Governor illustrate the advantages of a military administration in preventing labor disorders:

To Employees on the Silver Roll.

(1) I am informed that a strike of certain of our silver employees belonging to the U. B. of M. W. E. and R. S. L. has been decided upon by officers of that organization in the United States in conjunction with a strike of certain railroad employees which may possibly occur in the United States.

(2) I feel that I would be neglecting my plain duty to the men employed under my direction, in whose welfare I have a real interest, if I failed to counsel them to think over carefully before deciding to quit the service by striking.

(3) The wages of silver roll employees have always been based in a general way on the wages paid in the islands and countries near the Canal Zone. It has been the constant endeavor of the canal government to maintain for its employees a decent standard of living, with care for their housing, sanitary surroundings, and care in time of sickness.

(4) Wages have been increased from time to time to maintain the standard of decency and comfort, the latest adjustment having been made this month. With these adjustments, taking as a basis the actual increases in the prices of standard articles used, our employees will be able to live at the standard to which they have been accustomed, which is believed to be higher

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the standard for any community of the same class of labor elsewhere.

Remember what the facts are, and do not let them be distorted by false advisers who have no interest in you except to receive your contributions of money.

(5) There is no logical connection between the railroad employees in the United States and the silver employees on the isthmus. Their class of work is wholly dissimilar; local conditions there and here are in no way comparable; and it must be apparent to our silver men that it is unreasonable to call a strike here because of the troubles of railroad employees in the United States. There is no wisdom but much folly in such a proposition. I understand that you have paid your money to the organization in the United States. Will that organization finance a strike here? Will you share in the benefits they gain for themselves?

(6) Each man must make his own choice, without compulsion on the part of this Administration. If a strike occurs, those who remain at work will receive cards daily entitling them to all the privileges accorded them regularly as employees. Those who do not report for work will receive the usual clearance slip showing that they voluntarily quit, and their places will be filled as soon as practicable by men who appreciate the advantages of being in the service of the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company.

CHESTER HARDING, *Governor.*

Balboa Heights, C. Z., February 14, 1920

THE PANAMA CANAL,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
BALBOA HEIGHTS, C. Z., March 1, 1920.

All concerned: In order to avoid misunderstanding and confusion regarding the status of silver employees who are being reemployed the following instructions should be borne in mind:

Men who reported for duty on or before the usual hour for reporting for work after noon of February 27 and who have not been absent without proper excuse since then will not suffer any change in status and will receive the increase authorized to be effective February 1.

Those who have been or may be reemployed after the hour above specified will be reemployed strictly in accordance with the rules contained in Circulars 666-12 and 666-13. Their employment in February up to the time they voluntarily quit will be at the rates authorized including the February 1 increase, and their reemployment will be at a lower rate than the rate so received.

Clearances should be issued to the men who went on strike showing termination of service as "voluntarily quit," and conduct and workmanship ratings should take into account their record up to the time of quitting only. In other words, ignore the motive for quitting and rate each individual on his merits.

Men will be reemployed to the extent necessary to fill the positions not filled during the continuance of the strike, and discretion as to the men who will be refused employment is vested in the general foremen and officials of similar grade. These officials will decide whether the action of foremen or others under their supervision, in reemploying or declining to reemploy men who were on strike, is proper. It is desired that a spirit of tolerance be shown toward the men selected for reemployment, as they have been the victims of false advice and irresponsible leadership.

CHESTER HARDING, *Governor.*

THE PANAMA CANAL EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
BALBOA HEIGHTS, C. Z., March 8, 1920.

All concerned: I wish to express my heartfelt appreciation of the spirit of loyalty and patriotism exhibited by American citizens and others on the isthmus in their successful efforts to continue the essential functions of the canal and railroad during the recent strike of silver employees. The gratifying feature of this action rests not only in the defeat of the attempt of a large majority of the silver employees to impede the operation of the canal and railroad as a means to force compliance with the demands of irresponsible leaders, but also, and in large measure, on the spirit of pride and patriotism splendidly manifested in the determination to vindicate American efficiency and to uphold the spirit of Americanism in this great enterprise, through which the government of the United States serves the whole world.

The "esprit de corps" of the canal organization has been often manifested in the past, and it is gratifying to know that it continues to exist as an active and dependable force for the good of the canal.

CHESTER HARDING,
Governor, The Panama Canal.
President, Panama Railroad Company.

In Governor Harding's recent report on canal operations, the following interesting passages occur:

As a result of my refusal to grant the demands of the organized silver laborers for an increase in pay of 7 cents an hour and certain other conditions of employment, there was an organized strike of approximately 15,000 of 17,000 laborers on February 23. An investigation of the cost of living of these laborers and their rates of pay resulted in granting them an increase of 2 cents an hour, or $5 a month to monthly employees, effective February 1. This increase was granted after it had been determined that the increase in cost of the essentials of food and clothing had over-reached increases in pay. No further increases were justified.

Realizing that the mass of these men had been misled and misinformed, I announced that all who were not back at work on February 26 would be considered as having voluntarily left the service without due notice. Rules of long standing provide that in such cases reemployment may be only at a lower rate of pay than that received at the time of quitting. Meanwhile steps were taken to clear the canal quarters of persons not employed, and to fill the places of the men who had quit work. On March 2, the strike leaders officially advised the men to return to work; and a few days later the force was at its normal strength.

Except for about 2,000 West Indians and native laborers who remained loyal to the work, the strike of silver roll employees was complete. Thanks to the readiness of the American employees to turn to whatever work was given them to do, it was possible to keep the canal in operation, to feed and provide the force with water and light.

The Taboga Island Incident

THE Taboga Island controversy in which the United States and Panama have become involved is a matter to which three articles of the Canal Treaty appear to be applicable. The first of these, Article II, relates in part to the acquisition of the Canal Zone itself, and then continues:

The Republic of Panama further grants to the United States in perpetuity the use, occupation, and control of any other lands and waters outside of the zone above described which may be necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the said canal or any auxiliary canals or any other works necessary and convenient for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of said enterprise. The Republic of Panama further grants in like manner to the United States in perpetuity all islands within the limits of the zone above described, and in addition thereto the group of small islands in the Bay of Panama, named Perico, Naos, Culebra, and Flamenco.

The language of this article is rather vague, but does not by any means, according to the contention of Panama, give the United States blanket authority to seize any part of the Republic of Panama. Rather, it is held, the article grants

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the right of eminent domain, and the United States is obligated to prove to the satisfaction of Panama that its demands are "necessary and convenient" for the utilization of the canal. A further qualification appears in Article XXV.

For the better performance of the engagements of this convention and to the end of the efficient protection of the canal and the preservation of its neutrality, the government of the Republic of Panama will sell or lease to the United States lands adequate and necessary for naval or coaling stations on the Pacific Coast and on the Caribbean coast of the Republic, at certain points to be agreed upon with the President of the United States.

This provision, it is held, is inconsistent with any theory of blanket authority on the part of the United States, since it specifies, as does the clause in Article II referring to the small islands in the Bay of Panama, certain matters which would not need to be specified if the quoted part of that article were as inclusive as it appears apart from the context.

Moreover, Panama asserts that the United States has not complied with Article XVIII of the treaty, and that the American public is not informed as to the nature of this article. It reads:

The canal when constructed and the entrances thereto shall be neutral in perpetuity and shall be opened upon the terms provided for by Section 1 of Article III of, and in conformity with all the stipulations of, the treaty entered into by the governments of the United States and Great Britain on November 18, 1901.

The Taboga question arose abruptly, just after the end of the war, when the War Department announced its intention to occupy the island within five days. This brought the following communication (as translated from the Spanish text) to the State Department on behalf of the Republic of Panama, dated November 21, 1918:

. . . I received on the 18th of this month a cablegram from the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of my country informing me that the Governor of the canal had sent a communication to the President of the Republic on Saturday, the 16th of the same month, notifying him that the American government would occupy next Monday, the 18th instant, almost all the picturesque and healthful island of Taboga, which serves as a sanitarium and health resort for the residents of the capital and surrounding territory and is also the center of the pineapple industry, giving a product unrivalled in the world. In Taboga, moreover, is an agricultural population which has most of the island under cultivation and sustains itself in comfort, furnishing an example worthy of imitation, for if the rest of the territory of the republic were in the present condition of Taboga our country, in proportion to its size, would be one of the richest and most productive agricultural countries in the world.

The reason adduced by the Governor of the canal is that such occupation is necessary or convenient for the defense of the canal. In the same communication the President was informed that only the part of the island comprising the town of Taboga would remain unoccupied. This news produced natural alarm and anxiety in the Republic of Panama for which the island has great value, not only material but sentimental, and for many other considerations that would be too numerous to mention here and which Your Excellency knows.

The communication of the Governor of the canal being presented to the cabinet by the President of Panama, it was decided to give instructions to this legation to ask Your Excellency, as I most earnestly do now, to obtain the postponement of said occupation until I receive a communication now being prepared by the Secretary of Foreign Affairs of my country, because that occupation in the form proposed by the Governor of the canal to the President of Panama is unnecessarily prejudicial to the vital interests of the Republic of Panama, and also because in that note my government proposes to Your Excellency's government a solution satisfactory to the inhabitants of Panama and of the United States.

After my conference with Your Excellency on the 19th of this month on the grave incident with which I am dealing, I received another cablegram in which the President of Panama advised me that the Governor of the canal had communicated to him yesterday, the 20th, that he was acting under instructions of the War Department, and that he could not therefore postpone of his own accord the occupation of the island of Taboga. I was also urged to call once more Your Excellency's attention to the serious situation in which the people of Taboga and La Restinga would be placed if the occupation of the lands referred to should be carried out in such a way as to leave the inhabitants less than one-fifth the area of the island, which is small but densely populated. Such an area would be insufficient for the people of Taboga to raise crops for subsistence, and they would be obliged to emigrate, losing their homes, municipal buildings, and parochial buildings—equivalent to their ruin. The two villages of the island were founded in colonial times and are closely linked with the history of the isthmus through memories and traditions, among which I shall recall only that the island is the birthplace of Santa Rose de Lima, the patron saint of Latin-America and the only American woman ever canonized by the Catholic Church—a sentimental incident to which I refer because I consider it timely at this solemn moment when the President of the United States is the mouthpiece and apostle of the highest principles of self-determination of nationality, and when humanity is being moved by ideals which are evoked to make a better world than the one which brought the terrible catastrophe now ending. It is timely that I should refer to this historical tradition of a small nation, worthy, however, under every concept, of consideration for its domestic virtues and its industry, shown through many generations, particularly now that it is planned to submit it to so harsh and unnecessary an ordeal.

My government recommends me to obtain, through Your Excellency, the postponement of the occupation of Taboga pending a satisfactory agreement as to equitable compensation; or until there is established the clear preferability of the islands of Uraba or Taboguilla, the latter immediately in front of Taboga, with beaches and good water, and both without any population of importance; or of the Cerro de Chame. All three positions are very advantageous for the defense of the canal. The war being practically at an end, it does not seem to me that the matter justifies such haste as to require the elimination of the regular channels of the Department of State and of the American legation in Panama. . . .

A cablegram from the Panaman Foreign Office received at about this time by the legation at Washington read:

Inspector of land wants to compel the inhabitants of Taboga to sign some forms of sale of properties. The inhabitants are profoundly worried. The occupation of four-fifths of the island would ruin Taboga and La Restinga. Of the fifth that remains, 20 hectares belong to the Pacific Steamship Company and 12 are occupied by the townships.

On November 24, 1918, all the inhabitants of the island signed a memorial which they presented to the President of Panama, in which they said that the land inspector had threatened forcible seizure of the land, without payment, unless they filled the forms he had left. They urged the President to seek some means whereby they might retain their properties. For the time being expropriation was not put into effect and on January 19, 1920, Secretary Lansing wrote to the Panaman Minister as follows:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With reference to previous correspondence between yourself and the department relative to the acquisition of a part of Taboga Island, Republic of Panama, by the United States for fortification purposes, I desire to make known to you, at the request of the Secretary of War, that it will be necessary for the safety and protection of the canal for the United States to acquire a part of the island in the near future to place fortifications thereon.

In order, however, to allay as much as possible any anxiety on the part of the inhabitants of the island whose land must be appropriated I desire to assure you that no step will be taken in the expropriation of the inhabitants of the island without every consideration possible for their interest and convenience. In view of the improbability of initiating the construction of defensive works on a large scale on Taboga Island in the year 1920 the United States Government is anxious to adopt a liberal policy in regard to the removal of the inhabitants of that portion of the island transferred to its jurisdiction.

ROBERT LANSING

Nevertheless, while negotiations were under way at Washington, a War Department representative—so the Panaman Government asserts—appeared before the *Alcalde* of Taboga, announced the impending seizure and declared that he had come to make preliminary arrangements for expropriation. Vigorous protests were made to the Department of State, but probably the people of the United States would never have learned of the matter except through the demonstration which took place when General Pershing visited Panama—a demonstration directed not against the General, but against what was considered unwarranted action by this country. It succeeded in bringing the matter into the realm of discussion, not only in the United States, but even in Great Britain, where the question of Taboga was recently brought up in the House of Commons.

The present attitude of Panama is set forth in the following communication addressed by the Panaman Legation to the Department of State on May 7. The translation is made from the Spanish text.

As a supplement to my note D-No. 208, of April 30 last, in regard to the project of occupying part of Taboga Island in order to erect fortifications for the better defense of the Panama Canal, I have the honor of submitting to Your Excellency that the concrete desires of my government in this delicate matter are the following:

1. Reduction to a minimum of the area which it may be necessary to occupy, as was mentioned in my official note of April 30. My government estimates that 250 hectares will be sufficient for the purpose; otherwise the people of Taboga will be compelled to emigrate and abandon their homes.

2. The expropriation of these lands should be effected only to the extent that may be necessary for the execution of this project, and this should be brought about, with the intervention of the Panaman government, through the medium of the mixed commissions which established the canal treaty.

3. The people of Taboga should not be deprived of the elements indispensable for their subsistence and their hygiene, as it has been proposed to deprive them of their drinking water and the graveyard.

Permit me very respectfully to call Your Excellency's attention to the fact that the military authorities can solve the question of the water supply by artesian wells, for which they have machinery, without great expense to the government. To deprive the people of Taboga of water would cause them much hardship.

The Department of State on May 19 sent the following note in reply:

I have the pleasure of acknowledging the receipt of your communications of April 30 and May 7, relative to the acquisition of land required for defensive purposes on Taboga Island.

In reply I have the pleasure of informing you that the several points to which you allude in these two communications are receiving the department's serious consideration, in view of the desire of this government to conciliate the best interests of the residents of Taboga Island with the strategic requirements of the Canal Zone.

For the Secretary of State,

FRANK L. POLK

The Petrograd Unions to the British Proletariat

IN connection with the recent report of the British Labor Delegation to Russia, published in the issue of July 10 of the International Relations Section, the following combined appeal of the Petrograd Soviet of Trade Unions and of the Petrograd Factory Committee, translated from the *Krasnaya Gazetta* of May 14, is of interest.

Having heard the speeches of the representatives of the British Trade Unions and of Comrades Lozovsky, Tsyperovich, Ben Turner, and Allen, the general meeting resolved to ask the delegation of British Trade Unions to bring to the attention of all proletarians of Great Britain the following facts:

Surrounded by enemies on all sides Soviet Russia struggles, sending her best sons to the front. Her revolutionary energy and creative ability cannot be applied because of the constant dangers threatening the Russian proletariat. Transportation is disorganized, factories and mills are unable to work at their full rate, all this because of the aims of the ruling classes of Europe and America.

We, the workmen of the city of Petrograd, who have given hundreds of thousands of our brothers to all the fronts of Soviet Russia, who have been subjected these two and a half years to unbelievable tortures of hunger, who have many times driven off attacks from the side of the Russian counter-revolution, we appeal to you, English workmen!

We ask you how long will you continue to be patient, allowing the blood of Russian workmen to be shed in the name of England, and therefore in your name? How long, before you put the bridle on your rampant imperialists?

What tribute of sacrifice must the Russian proletariat still give; for how many weeks, months, and years must our children die of hunger, so that the bankers and financial vultures of Paris, London, and New York may fill their pockets, while the workmen of these countries could have long ago, by a single friendly effort, lifted the burden of suffering that the Russian proletariat has had to endure?

How much more time do you need to understand that the destruction of the Russian revolution is also your destruction, that our defeat is also your defeat?

When will you, tens of millions of British proletarians, cease to believe the false reports about us in the corrupt bourgeois press, and have done with the exploiters of your land and their hired scribes?

The Petrograd proletariat asks you to give answer to these questions. Standing at the advance posts of world revolution, it has the right to demand an answer. In sending to you revolutionary fraternal greetings, the Petrograd workmen hope that their English brothers of the toiling classes will abandon the traditions of peaceful struggle, and sweep away their exploiter-imperialists by an iron revolutionary will. This is the help which the Russian proletariat is asking of you. Your revolutionary effort will bring aid to the Russian proletariat, but first and above all to the toiling masses of England itself.

Long live the international struggle against imperialism!

Long live the British Soviet Republic!

Long live the International Soviet of Workmen's Delegates!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ALICE KAUSER DRAMATISTS' AGENT — PLAYS
ESTABLISHED 1895
1402 BROADWAY NEW YORK
Motion Picture Department
R. L. GIFFEN, Associate Manager

Story Writing Properly Taught

Expert instruction in Short-story Writing will be given by the staff of Pearson's Magazine, under the personal supervision of Frank Harris. Persons whose experience with other "courses" has been unsatisfactory, will find here a service of superior worth. Careful criticism and revision of single manuscripts also made by professional writers. Fees for either service moderate. For information address,

PEARSON'S LITERARY SERVICE, 57 Fifth Ave., New York

Just Published

No. 68. Illustrated Catalogue of

Rare Books in Beautiful Old Bindings

The DR. R. T. JUPP COLLECTION of

MSS., AUTOGRAPHS, BOOKS, etc., etc., by or relating to

CHARLES DICKENS

The Collection of Relics of the Original Dora of DAVID COPPERFIELD

BOOKS ON THE FINE ARTS, SPORT

and an extensive collection of BOOKS ON SHORTHAND

Fine Sets of First Editions of CHARLES LEVER, GEORGE MEREDITH and CAPTAIN MARRYAT, GOULD'S BIRDS of AUSTRALIA, etc.

Post free from

HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.

Booksellers to the King

43, Piccadilly, W. 1,

or, 140 Strand, W. C. 2.

Cable Address; Bookmen, London **London, England.**

Hugo's Masterpiece, 25c.

In "The Last Days of a Condemned Man," Victor Hugo takes you inside the cell of a condemned man and depicts for you his inmost thoughts. A most smashing indictment of capital punishment.

APPEAL TO REASON, GIRARD, KANSAS.

A Cooperative Print Shop

offers the best assurance that work will have prompt, intelligent handling, and that costs will be lower than in other shops giving an equal service and equal quality.

The Nation Press is a complete cooperative democracy where each worker, from the skilled journeyman to the messenger boy, is interested in pleasing the customer.

THE NATION PRESS, INC.

Telephone 9092 Barclay

20 VESEY STREET NEW YORK

NEWS FROM NOWHERE by WILLIAM MORRIS is the most charming Utopia ever written, picturing a society in which everybody does pleasant work, and profiteers and politicians are extinct. New edition, cloth, $1.25 by mail or at bookstores. Catalog free. **Charles H. Kerr & Company, 347 East Ohio Street, Chicago.**

WE have just compiled a booklet containing the latest information and statistics about the

SAAR VALLEY

its wealth, resources and industries. Of valuable interest to investors. Free on request.

We own and offer for spot delivery, 4% Bonds of the City of Saarbruecken. 4% Community Bonds of the Mortgage Bank, Saarbruecken.

VON POLENZ & CO., Inc.

60 Broadway **New York**

Telephone Bowling Green 4320

Boston *Philadelphia* *Milwaukee*
Cincinnati *Chicago* *Denver*
Berlin

INDEX *for* VOLUME 110

(*January—June 1920*)

has been delayed, but it will be ready for distribution in a few weeks.

One copy will be sent to each library on our subscription list, but to other subscribers *only upon request.*

If you want this index let us know at once.

SUBSCRIPTION DEPARTMENT

The Nation

20 Vesey St. New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED